



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2003

No. 39

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 11, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB SIMMONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) for 5 minutes.

COLOMBIAN COFFEE CRISIS

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, to most Americans coffee is nothing more than a morning pick-me-up, a drink over which to socialize, or an excuse to reacquire ourselves with old friends or even to make new ones. But to Latin America, our neighbors down there, coffee is a way of life, a key to survival, and a hope for the future.

As many of my colleagues may know, coffee prices are at a record low. Latin American families who once made a good living at farming coffee are now

being forced to leave the farm to find other work. Oftentimes, that means risking life and limb to emigrate to the United States or to engage in the illegal production and trafficking of narcotics just to survive.

As a businessman, I fully comprehend the ebbs and flows of commodity trading and the effects that oversupply can have on a market. But there is much more to the current coffee situation than profit margins. Latin Americans produce the highest-quality coffee anywhere in the world, but they cannot make a living from it. Without immediate action, the consequences will be felt well beyond the coffee fields.

It is important to remember that democracy is still young and fragile in Latin America. Growing poverty and an increasing lack of real economic opportunities are now threatening the very democracy that thousands of Latin Americans have risked, and sometimes lost, their lives to establish. Over the years, I have worked with Latin leaders to promote economic opportunities that would strengthen new democracies and improve the lives of their citizens. The production of real quality coffee, for instance, once brought unheard of prosperity to many of the communities in Central and South America. But with the price of quality coffee falling to historic lows, the flood of lesser- and cheaper-quality coffee entering the global market, these very communities are now left destitute and questioning the benefits of democracy.

Last July, the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, which I chair, held a hearing on what some have termed the "coffee crisis." Some may refute the premise that there is such a crisis. The abandoned coffee plantations of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Colombia, and elsewhere, coupled with the thousands of people who are now out of work, tell a different story. There is a crisis.

During the hearing, witnesses testified that the trade in coffee is negatively affecting the local, national, and regional economies of our hemisphere. The overproduction of coffee is the result of unrestricted imports from places like Vietnam, where coffee is not a traditional crop and the farmers are heavily subsidized by the communist government. In a span of just a few years, Vietnam has emerged as the second leading exporter of coffee in the world. This oversupply has driven coffee prices to their lowest level in 30 years, to just a fraction of what they were a few years ago.

As a result of this hearing, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and I cosponsored House Resolution 604, along with eight other Members of Congress. The resolution simply expresses the sense of the House that the United States should adopt a global strategy with coordinated activities in Latin America, Africa, and Asia to address the short-term humanitarian needs and long-term rural development needs of countries affected by the collapse of coffee prices. It encourages the President to explore measures to support and complement multilateral efforts to respond to the global coffee crisis. But more importantly, it urges the private sector coffee buyers and roasters to work with the United States to seek their own solution to the crisis which is economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable.

Numerous foreign firms are already helping farmers move away from drug production and improve the local economies. A French grocery company, Carrefour, entered into a contract with the Colombian organic and specialty coffee farmers to buy their coffee at slightly higher prices to be marketed in Carrefour stores. While I am not prone to say anything really nice about the French, especially recently, this is the type of corporate citizenship

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1691

that should be emulated. This simple act of corporate citizenship is providing coffee consumers the best coffee available while giving the farmers and their families a way to earn a living without having to produce drugs. I also understand that Starbucks and Green Mountain engage in outreach programs for the Latin coffee farmers that allow them to purchase quality coffees for their shops.

In conclusion, if we stand by and allow the crisis to worsen, we are committing ourselves to more drastic action in the medium to long term when the crisis will have spiraled to our further detriment. As the crisis deepens, so do the problems at the U.S. border, such as massive migration and the inflow of more illegal drugs like cocaine and heroin. Although there are efforts under way to address this problem, more action must be taken. I encourage my colleagues to join me in solving this crisis.

IMPLICATIONS OF WAR WITH IRAQ MUST BE EXPLAINED BY ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the administration continues to assert rightly that Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator, but the administration fails to explain how a preemptive war is in the best interest of the American people.

On February 25 I introduced House Joint Resolution 24 with the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL.) The resolution requires the President to submit a new report to Congress that answers eight specific questions. It includes a sense of Congress clause that requests the President present the report before a public joint session of Congress.

It is our duty in Congress on behalf of the American people to ensure that if the President authorizes military force against Iraq, that he first give Congress a full accounting of the potential cost and the potential consequences.

The two reports submitted to Congress by the administration under requirements of the October resolution have failed to communicate the President's plans for Iraq. The administration in reports included no indication of the potential financial costs of the war and its aftermath, no indication of how weapons of mass destruction will be secured, and no discussion of blowbacks, the CIA term for terrorist actions against the United States.

The second report clearly acknowledges the magnitude of the task of reconstructing and stabilizing Iraq, calling it a massive undertaking. Unfortunately, the report fails to explain how this challenge will be overcome, what level of financial, what level of polit-

ical, what level of military commitment that the administration is willing to make in Iraq after the war.

Before the U.S. initiates a preemptive strike, something we have never done before, without the consensus of the U.N. Security Council and in the absence of a clear, imminent threat to the United States of America, the administration must clearly explain to the American people the short- and long-term implications of attacking Iraq. H.R. 24 asks, and the administration should answer to the American public and to Congress:

Have we exhausted every diplomatic means of disarming Iraq?

Will America be safer from terrorism if we attack Iraq?

How will we deal with the humanitarian crisis that inevitably will follow this war?

How will the war with Iraq affect our already weak economy?

What will reconstruction of Iraq and providing humanitarian assistance to that country cost? And how long will it take, how long will American troops and civilians be stationed there and at what cost?

How will attacking Iraq prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, when Korea and Libya and other countries, and Iran, for instance, are much further along with nuclear development, we know, than Iraq is?

What will preemptive war do to the stability of the Middle East?

Are we ready to commit to a decade of military troops policing Iraq and the billions of dollars needed to rebuild and stabilize that country and make that country, in the words of the President, into a democracy?

These important questions need to be answered to the American public before President Bush decides preemptively, without U.N. support, to attack another country.

The Washington Post reported today: "The greatest source of concern among senior army leaders is the uncertainty and complexity of the mission in post-war Iraq, which could require U.S. forces," and get this, "to protect Iraq's borders, referee clashes between ethnic and religious groups, ensure civilian security, provide humanitarian relief, secure possible chemical and biological weapon sites, and govern hundreds of towns and villages." Simply put, we could be in the middle of a civil war.

How has the administration responded to these concerns? With silence. There are no legitimate plans for reconstruction that anyone has seen. There are no cost estimates for the conflict or the post-conflict occupation. There are no casualty estimates. These are concerns we must address.

Retired Army Major General William Nash commanded the first peace-keeping operation in the Balkans in 1995. After the Gulf War in 1991, he occupied the area around the Iraqi town of Safwan on the Kuwaiti border almost 2 years ago. He told The Post that during this time his troops dealt with

recurring murders, attempted murders, "ample opportunity," in his words, "for civil disorder," and refugee flows they could never fully fathom. He went on to say that 200,000 U.S. and allied forces will be necessary to stabilize Iraq. Two hundred thousand.

Note that he uses the term "allied forces" in that total. If we continue on the course we are on, there will be few allied forces. Maybe Great Britain, maybe a few Turks, if we pay them enough, maybe a few Spaniards, maybe a few Italians, but overwhelming almost all of those 200,000 will be Americans and we will be footing the bill alone.

The civilian leadership at the Pentagon and the Department of Defense continually refuse to acknowledge the enormity of the challenge in post-conflict Iraq. They respond to inquiries with delay tactics and uncertain estimates.

I am certain of one thing, Mr. Speaker. Any action against Iraq will be difficult, costly, and dangerous if we do not go to the U.N. Security Council.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a very important issue: domestic violence. Last week marked the second annual "Stop Violence Week in Washington." A series of events were held here to encourage men and women to come together to stop violence.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, this issue is of particular concern to me. In the 108th Congress, our subcommittee will be tackling important issues relating to violence prevention. The Bureau of Justice statistics estimate that in 1998 about 1 million crimes were committed against persons by their current or former spouses, boyfriends, or girlfriends. These types of crimes are generally referred to as "intimate partner violence," and women are the victims in about 85 percent of the cases. In 1998, in excess of 1,800 murders were committed by persons against their intimate partners.

Although these statistics are shocking, we have made great strides in the last 2 decades at increasing awareness of this problem, which is half the battle. Congress has taken an active role in addressing the problem by authorizing expiring grant programs and establishing new grants to more effectively target violence and abuse. Federal grant dollars are available through the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to be used by State and local authorities to assist their communities and schools in fighting violence. For example, grants may be used by local

authorities to aid law enforcement officers and prosecutors in gathering evidence and building cases to bring violent criminals to justice.

These grants also may be used to operate training programs for victim advocates and counselors. Many victims of domestic violence and sexual assault are afraid to retell their stories to friends, family or a counselor. Training people to know how to assist victims of domestic violence is a necessary tool in fighting this epidemic and preventing future abuse.

The 2000 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act created new grants to be used to address violence issues on college campuses. It also authorized new grant monies to assist victims of violence with legal concerns and to address violence against the elderly and disabled.

Continuing its commitment to fighting violence and domestic abuse, Congress provided generous monies again this year to the Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women.

It is important to recognize the work and dedication as well of groups committed to increasing awareness surrounding domestic violence through education campaigns, intervention, and counseling.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, the National Network to End Domestic Violence, the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the National Center for Victims of Crimes are just a few groups that are active in ridding our Nation, our homes, of violence. Many State and local groups across the country also work day to day to prevent violence, aggressively enforce penalties, and counsel victims of violent crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will continue to fund outreach and education programs and encourage individuals to work together to change attitudes towards these crimes. It is clear that we are making progress in this area, but we must continue to work together to eradicate violence against women. To all of those working at the local, State and Federal level to eliminate domestic violence and sexual abuse, we express our thanks to them for their selfless efforts and dedication. We hope that our support in the Congress will assist them in this very important battle and fight.

HONORING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMONS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Speaker, this week Puerto Rico is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the University of Puerto Rico, our oldest and most prominent higher education institution. One hundred years ago, the Uni-

versity of the Puerto Rico was founded as a training center for teachers, and opened its doors with just 173 students. Since then, the UPR has evolved to become the foremost Hispanic-serving institution in the United States, and one of the leading universities in the Spanish-speaking world. Today the UPR offers 485 academic programs in practically all areas of learning and has a student body of about 70,000 students.

The political, cultural and economic development of Puerto Rico has been closely linked to the UPR. From governors, Supreme Court judges, and NASA engineers to world-renowned authors and poet laureates, all can be found in the UPR alumni. I am proud to be one of thousands of alumni of the UPR that today pay tribute to our alma mater. We look forward to another 100 years of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico, to the University of Puerto Rico, to its students, and to its alumni on its 100-year anniversary.

COVER THE UNINSURED WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this week is Cover the Uninsured Week where lawmakers, the media, and our constituents will consider how we can help provide health care coverage for some 35 million Americans. No doubt some will pronounce that the answer lies in a single payer, universal health care coverage program. I say there are better ways. Why? Let us look at countries that do have national health care in place and see its problems.

Let me share with Members a story I read in a February 13 article in the New York Times about the growing lag on the Canadian health care system. According to this article, a Canadian government study shows that 4.3 million Canadians, 18 percent of those who saw a doctor in 2001, had a problem getting tests or surgery done in a timely fashion. Three million could not find a family physician. Canada spends \$86 billion on the health care. Only the United States, Germany and Switzerland spend more as a proportion of economic output, but budget cuts since the early 1990s have impeded efforts to keep health care up to date.

Waiting lines have also increased because an aging population is placing more demands on the system. A study by the Fraser Institute recently concluded that patients across Canada experience waiting times of 16.5 weeks between receiving a referral from a general practitioner and undergoing treatment in 2001-2002, a rate 77 percent longer than in 1993.

Mr. Speaker, can Members imagine an insured American putting up with a wait for 4 months? As Members can imagine, those with the means to seek other options do not, due to what the

Canadians call "line jumping" by the affluent and well-connected.

While the goal of many who recommended socialized health care is egalitarian, equal health services for all, that is exactly what they get, an equally long wait for all. But if a Canadian has money, they just fly south to a private physician in the United States. My State of Florida is notoriously a haven for Canadian snowbirds to winter in and seek medical care.

Last month I had members of various Canadian provincial governments visit me asking how they could work out an arrangement and fee schedule with physicians in Florida to provide services to them.

And to point out another example of the erosion of egalitarian goal that national health care is supposed to provide, there is an ad for an up-scale maternity service in London's Portland Hospital. It points out women do not have to be famous to give birth there, they just need to have money. Deluxe private suites, champagne, and a beauty salon are just among some of the amenities. I thought all English women could receive quality, timely obstetrical care in their assigned hospital. But why then would the Duchess of York and supermodel Jerry Hall choose to have their babies outside the socialized system, because those who can afford to pay want choice, and we should provide nothing less for all Americans.

To seek a legacy in his final years of office, Canada's Prime Minister Jean Chretien has agreed to spend \$9 billion more over the next 3 years. Fortunately for Canadians, the system's shortfalls have opened the way for tentative but growing movements toward privately managed medical services.

Let us resolve today to promote choice and opportunity for the uninsured to obtain the health care plan that works best for them. One of the major ways is to institute a tax parity into health insurance. The 90 percent of us who receive our health insurance through our employers are receiving a substantial tax benefit. We should extend this to those in the individual market also.

When this Congress convened on January 7, I introduced my bill, H.R. 198, that would allow any tax filer to deduct 100 percent of the cost of their health insurance as well as non-reimbursed prescription drugs. Currently, only the self-employed can deduct 100 percent, but what about the unemployed or the retired? H.R. 198 would help them also. Likewise, many of my colleagues have introduced legislation to provide tax credits for Americans to use for purchasing health care. These are all ways we can help cover the uninsured and enable them to purchase the health insurance of their choice.

LONG LINES MAR CANADA'S LOW-COST HEALTH CARE

(By Clifford Krauss)

TORONTO, Feb. 11—During a routine self-examination last May, Shirley Magee found

a lump on her breast. Within weeks she had it and some lymph nodes removed. So far so good, until it came to the follow-up therapy.

Mrs. Magee, a 55-year-old public school secretary, researched her condition on the Internet, and read that optimally, radiation treatment should begin two weeks after surgery. But the local provincial government clearinghouse that manages the waiting time for radiation therapy told her she had to wait until the end of September—nearly three months after her surgery—to begin treatment.

"I was supposed to feel lucky I got in so quickly," said Mrs. Magee, still viscerally annoyed though she has since successfully completed her radiation regime. "It's a horrible feeling that something in your body is ticking that you have no control over. If I were a politician's wife I wouldn't have had to wait."

Long heralded for giving all Canadians free health insurance and paying for almost all medical expenses, the health care system founded in the 1960's has long been the third rail all of Canadian politics; not to be touched by private hands, nor altered by Parliament.

But growing complaints about long lines for diagnosis and surgery, as well as widespread line-jumping by the affluent, and connected, are eroding public confidence in Canada's national health care system and producing a leading issue for next year's national elections.

A recent government study indicated that 4.3 million Canadian adults—or 18 percent of those who saw a doctor in 2001—reported they had difficulty seeing a doctor or getting a test or surgery done in a timely fashion. Three million Canadians are unable to find a family physician, according to several private studies, producing a situation all the more serious since it is the family doctor who refers patients to specialists and medical testing.

"The sky isn't falling, but things are not rosy," said Dr. Dana W. Hanson, president of the Canadian Medical Association. "Nevertheless if things are not fixed, the sky may fall."

Canada spends \$86 billion a year on health care—only the United States, Germany and Switzerland spend more as a proportion of total economic output—but budget cutbacks since the early 1990's have impeded efforts to keep health care up to date. A recent report by the Senate's Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology indicates that well over 30 percent of the country's medical imaging devices are obsolete.

Overworked technology is one reason for the long lines; others include a shortage of nurses and inefficient management of hospital and other health care facilities, according to several studies.

Waiting times have also increased because an aging population has put more demands on the system, while the current generation of doctors is working fewer hours than the last.

Waiting can occur at every step of treatment. A study by the conservative Fraser Institute concluded that patients across Canada experienced average waiting times of 16.5 weeks between receiving a referral from a general practitioner and undergoing treatment in 2001-2002, a rate 77 percent longer than in 1993. The recent Senate report noted that waiting times for M.R.I., CT, and ultrasound scans grew by 40 percent since 1994.

"Waiting lists are the hornets' nests that are jeopardizing the system," said Dr. Tirone E. David, professor of surgery at the University of Toronto. He noted that Ontario residents needed to wait an average of two months to see a cardiologist unless it was an

emergency, queries for angiograms took four to six weeks, and waiting times between initial examination and micro-valve repairs could take as long as six months.

"It wasn't that way 15 years ago," Dr. David added. "It does not alter the ultimate outcome, but there's an anguish and uncertainty when a person feels their life is in a holding pattern for up to a year."

Defenders of the Canadian system note that only patients waiting months for non-emergency care, like treatments for cataracts and hernias skew the waiting time statistics.

And they argue that within life expectancy of 78 years, Canadians still enjoy one of the longest life expectancies in the world, slightly higher than the United States where 41 million people have no health insurance.

Still recent polls show that while Canadians want to keep their national system they are worried about its future effectiveness.

"I don't think there's a lot of patience among the public for a lot more study," said Deputy Prime Minister John Manley in a recent interview noting that his own driver needed to wait a year for hip replacement surgery. "There's not a lot of time to deal with it."

In response to the growing concerns, Prime Minister Jean Chretien and the Senate conducted studies of the system, that concluded in recent months that shortages of doctors, nurses and diagnostic equipment had caused at least some deterioration of care over the last 10 years.

Seeking a legacy in his final year in office, Mr. Chretien agreed last week to spend over \$9 billion more over the next three years on programs to improve diagnostic equipment, primary care, drug coverage and home care. But the provincial and territorial premiers say that isn't nearly enough to alleviate shortages of services, particularly in rural areas.

The system's shortfalls have opened the way for tentative but growing moves toward privately managed medical services and user fee in return for quicker service. A hospital in Montreal has begun charging fees for some surgical procedures and renting operating rooms to patients for several hundred dollars an hour. A Vancouver hospital has begun selling full-body C.T. scans for \$860.

In an effort to reduce waiting lists, the provinces of Alberta, Nova Scotia and Ontario have established about 30 private M.R.I. and C.T. clinics, some of which offer nonemergency services to be paid for by private insurance.

"With the system cracking at the edges and waiting lists growing, people will eventually stay 'all right, let me pay," said Dr. Tom McGowan, president of Canadian Radiation Oncology Services, Canada's first for-profit cancer radiation treatment center which has treated nearly 2,000 patients since it opened in Toronto two years ago. (Patients still pay nothing at the radiation clinic; Dr. McGowan is paid by the province and receives bonuses if he surpasses productivity targets.)

The Ontario provincial government allowed Dr. McGowan to open his night clinic after it was forced to send 1,650 cancer patients to the United States for radiation treatments during a 25-month period in 2000 and 2001 because of waiting lists that were up to 16 weeks long.

Dr. McGowan said the emergency, which cost the province \$20 million in travel costs, was not rooted in a shortage of equipment nor staff but inefficient public management. Whatever the reasons his patients are quick to tell horror stories about their waits for diagnostic tests and treatments.

"Your worst fear is it is going to grow while you are waiting," said Pat McMeekin,

a 53-year-old hospital clerical worker, recalling the two months she had to wait between a mammogram and the first of two biopsies confirming she had breast cancer last summer. "When you have something you want to take care of it and be done with it."

TOLERANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was here on September 11, 2001. I saw the skies filled with mud-brown smoke rising from the devastation at the Pentagon. I felt that anger that every American felt then and that continues to simmer in the lesser angels of our nature to this very hour.

There is in my heartland Indiana district a small mosque in Muncie, Indiana, where each weekend a small community, less than 1,000 people of Arabic descent, gather to practice their religious faith, each of them contributing in important ways in our community. They reached me in the immediate hours after September 11 and expressed to me their concern as family people for their well-being in the wake of this attack that was unanimously effected by Arab extremists against our country.

It was then that I issued a statement I read again today. I said then that the terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon are not representative of the overwhelming majority of Arabs or Muslims in the United States, and we could not allow anger at this horrible act to lead us to hate or discriminate against innocent individuals who happened to be of Middle Eastern descent. I said that terror has no regard for religion or ethnicity, and if we attack the innocent simply because of their ethnic status, we are no better than the terrorists who attacked us.

So we come to these days in which we find ourselves again perhaps on the precipice of a war in the Middle East, with the news in our Muncie newspaper this weekend that a recent graduate of Ball State University was arrested on terrorist charges at his home in Idaho. I thought with this news and the potential for war abroad and terrorist attacks at home, it would be appropriate to rise again to remind the people of my district and the State and even of this country that we cannot allow the hatred that terrorists and their sympathizers possess to inflame our hearts and distort our communities.

I urge my fellow citizens to continue to embrace those ideals of the Declaration of Independence, and understand while we believe and have built a Nation founded on the premise that all men are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, we cannot and must not give voice of persecution or permit acts of discrimination

against those among us of Middle Eastern descent. Millions of Arab Americans, like those in my district, contribute daily in vital ways to our communities and our Nation in every professional class, medicine, academia, engineering, and yes, to the U.S. armed forces.

The Good Book tells us, and what does the Lord require of you? To do justice, to love kindness, to walk humbly with your God. Let us as we go into these difficult times and in the difficult days ahead rededicate ourselves to practice justice and kindness toward every American, citizen and visitor of Middle Eastern descent, that we may hold up those ideals that brave Americans fight to defend in these days.

ALLIED SUPPORT FOR WAR AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am confused today. I have been in Congress 17 years and I have been a strong supporter of our relations with our European friends, with parliamentarians from Russia, Ukraine, China, and every other major nation in the world. I have traveled to France and Germany several times, and have hosted scores of members of parliaments.

But what I saw occur last week and what I am hearing coming out of the President's mouth disturbs and confuses me. President Chirac of France and his counterpart, Chancellor Schroeder of Germany, have said that they will not support the U.S. effort to remove Saddam Hussein from Iraq. They have further said there is no justification for war unless it is approved by the U.N. Security Council.

□ 1300

But I look at each country and I wonder what they are referring to, because it was France just 4 years ago when they wanted the U.S. to come in and assist them militarily in removing Milosevic from power in Belgrade. It was France who came to the U.S. and convinced our President to put our sons and daughters in harm's way. But in doing so, along with the French, in pushing America to fight this military battle, they would not go to the U.N. Security Council because they knew that Russia would veto any resolution.

So what did France and Germany do? Just a few short years ago, for the first time and only time in NATO's history, along with our President, at that time Bill Clinton, they used a NATO military force to invade a non-NATO sovereign nation to remove the head of state, and that head of state was Slobodan Milosevic. Now, Milosevic was a bad guy, a war criminal, he has done bad things, but everyone, includ-

ing the special rapporteur for human rights at the U.N., Max van der Stoep, including Bill Clinton's own Ambassador to the U.N., Ambassador Holbrooke, have all said publicly that, in fact, Saddam Hussein is far worse than Milosevic ever was. In fact, a U.N. special rapporteur said there has been no leader since Adolf Hitler who has done the kinds of human rights abuses that Saddam Hussein has done.

How, then, can France and Germany when just a few short years ago for their own benefit, because a neighbor was threatening in their case, they felt, their security, enticed the U.S. to come in and use our troops to remove Milosevic from power militarily and today say, in a situation far, far worse in Saddam Hussein, that force is not justified?

I am also reminded of just a year ago, President Jacques Chirac, saying it again, the U.N. Security Council is the final group that should decide the change of regimes, sent French troops to the Ivory Coast because of a coup attempt, sent French troops there, without going to the U.N. Security Council, without asking for a vote, without employing the very tactics that he is standing up now and demanding around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled. The French and Germans have been our longtime friends, and hopefully they will be once this is over; but the words coming out of the mouths of Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schroeder and their foreign ministers leave me confused and bewildered. I really wonder what France stands for. I really wonder what Germany stands for. Are they really against human rights abuses as defined by Amnesty International and every other major human rights group? Are they really convinced that people who are bad actors like Milosevic should be removed from office, as we did with their pushing and support just a few years ago militarily? And if so, why the change with Saddam Hussein? I hope it is not because of the ties to oil that France has with Iraq. I would hope that is not the case with the French. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the proper response is.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD two letters which were sent by me to President Jacques Chirac last Friday and Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, also last Friday, which basically lay out the facts and then asks the question of the French and Germans, Do you have a double standard? Is it okay to entice America to come in and fight a battle in front of you in your backyard to remove a leader that you have said publicly is a human rights abuser, even though you do not want to go to the U.N. and did not go to the U.N. to achieve the U.N.'s support? Is it okay to do that and then a few years later, after 12 years of seeing Saddam Hussein kill tens of thousands of innocent people, use chemical weapons against the Kurds, commit war crimes against our own American

POWs, 21 of them, in fact, and, in fact, commit the most horrendous crimes against the Kuwaitis and all the other minority groups inside Iraq, and then to come forward and say, "Well, in this case it's different"?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2003

President JACQUES CHIRAC,

Republic of France, c/o Embassy of France, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CHIRAC: As a long time friend of the French people and a steadfast facilitator of inter-parliamentary cooperation between our nations, I am compelled to contact you to express my disappointment with your government's actions. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have hosted dozens of French parliamentarians, traveled to your country to speak to government officials and industry leaders, and endeavored to strengthen the relations between our great nations. However, I was outraged today by your Foreign Minister's statements before the United Nations opposing the use of force to uphold the United Nations Charter and the sixteen multilateral resolutions written after the Gulf War cease-fire in 1991. Your government's words and actions have done serious, if not permanent, damage to the once unshakable foundations of the great transatlantic alliance that has served our mutual interests for so long.

Your continued opposition to the use of force to disarm Iraq without the full support of the United Nations is steeped in hypocrisy of such epic proportions, that your sudden reverence for the inviolability of the United Nations is laughable. When the dictator Milosevic threatened western Europe's back door, France was entirely content to bypass the United Nations Security Council and take military action. History will forever judge your use of NATO—championing the organization's first offensive action against a non-member—without any attempt to employ the global diplomacy of the United Nations. The actions of your Foreign Minister opposing the dedication of the United States stands in stark contradiction to the practices and motivations of your government in Yugoslavia. During negotiations within the Security Council amidst the NATO engagement, Alain Dejammet justified France's actions through the enforcement of three resolutions under Chapter VII on Kosovo and Yugoslavia's refusal to fulfill its obligations under those agreements. Your opposition and veto threat sends a disturbing message to future generations that international interference is no longer desired to end genocide, obstruct terrorism or aid a suffering people under a demonic regime. Even more disturbing, is that the efforts to remove the cancer of Slobodan Milosevic could not have been accomplished without the vast majority of coalition troops, air strikes and logistical support provided by the United States. In fact, France went to great lengths to have America commit our sons and daughters for this moral purpose, and we dutifully obliged.

I am quite sure that the foreign ministers of France and Germany slept soundly while the bombs fell on Kosovo without United Nations approval. However, the historically peaceful people of France are now roused to defend the sacred honor of the Security Council, the very same Security Council whose honor they flouted just five years ago. Convenience, not principle, seems to be France's guiding compass. Your constant opposition to America's effort to remove a regime that has continually violated several, if not all of the human rights provisions within the United Nations charter and presents an increasing threat to democracies all over the world is nothing short of appalling. The dictatorship in Iraq far surpasses the practice of

murder and oppression that ever existed in Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, your country insists on turning a blind eye to the atrocities and breeding ground for terrorism that fail to occur near the borders of old Europe.

France's continued indifference to the plight of the Iraqi people, its neighbors and those who fall subject to Saddam Hussein's evil rule defies explanation. The atrocities perpetrated under Hussein's regime are well documented by organizations such as Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights, Amnesty International, the Coalition for International Justice and even the United Nations. In fact, the former United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in Iraq, Max Van der Stoep, stated that "the brutality of the Iraqi regime was of an exceptionally grave character, so grave that it has few parallels in the years that have passed since the Second World War. . . . It is to comparisons with the obscenity of the Holocaust and Stalin's mass murders that observers are inevitably drawn when confronted with the horrors of Saddam's Iraq. . . . This is a state that employs arbitrary execution, imprisonment and torture on a comprehensive and routine basis."

The vile methods of torture inflicted upon Coalition prisoners of the Gulf War, Kuwaitis, Kurds, Shi'it Muslims, Iranians, Turkomans, and anyone else who dares to live a life contrary to the wishes of Saddam Hussein are well documented. Primitive executions, dismemberment, castration, hangings by barbed wire, the raping of women in front of family members and children, burning flesh with acid, finger and toenail extraction, boring holes into bodies with drills and the ignition of gasoline pumped into various orifices of the human body are routine measures employed by Hussein and his henchmen.

Yet France continues to make every effort to block Hussein's removal and protect a despot whose country has the highest number of disappearances and displaced persons in the World. You callously refuse to acknowledge the documented destruction of life and repeated offensive military actions against surrounding countries since the 1970's. Your actions condone the blatant disregard of United Nations resolutions since 1991, and repeatedly make it clear that international law should not be honored. The statements made today and your acquiescence may forever undermine the peaceful objectives that are the foundation of international law and serve to entice future evils.

America will not follow France's lead and remain content to concern ourselves solely with problems that border our country. We will not allow economic investments and resource dependency to impede our future judgments to alleviate the suffering of others. The American people and my colleagues in Congress will not soon forget the rank hypocrisy and blatant disloyalty displayed by your country today, and I am confident that the free people of the world will also refuse to follow your misguided lead.

Sincerely,

CURT WELDON,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2003.

Chancellor GERHARD SCHRÖDER,
Federal Republic of Germany, c/o Embassy of
Germany, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHANCELLOR SCHRÖDER: As a long time friend of the German people and a steadfast facilitator of inter-parliamentary cooperation between our nations, I am compelled to contact you. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have hosted dozens of Bundestag members, served on the German Caucus and U.S. Congress-German Bundestag Study

Group, and endeavored to strengthen the relations between our great Nations. However, I was outraged today by your Foreign Minister's statements before the United Nations opposing the use of force to uphold the United Nations Charter and the sixteen multilateral resolutions written after the Gulf War cease-fire in 1991. Your government's words and actions have done serious, if not permanent, damage to the once unshakable foundations of the great transatlantic alliance that has served our mutual interests for so long.

Your continued opposition to the use of force to disarm Iraq without the full support of the United Nations is steeped in hypocrisy of such epic proportions, that your sudden reverence for the inviolability of the United Nations is laughable. When the dictator Milosevic threatened western Europe's back door, Germany was entirely content to bypass the United Nations Security Council and take military action. History will forever judge your use of NATO—championing the organization's first offensive action against a non-member—without any attempt to employ the global diplomacy of the United Nations. The actions of your Foreign Minister opposing the dedication of the United States stands in stark contradiction to the practices and motivations of your government in Yugoslavia. In fact, Minister Joschka Fischer himself characterized the Serbian actions as a "declaration of war against the policy of European integration. It is not only a question of morality or of human rights, it is a question of security and stability in Europe." Your opposition sends a disturbing message to future generations that international interference is no longer desired to end genocide, obstruct terrorism or aid a suffering people under a demonic regime. Even more disturbing, is that the efforts to remove the cancer of Slobodan Milosevic could not have been accomplished without the vast majority of coalition troops, air strikes and logistical support dedicated to your effort by the United States. In fact, Germany went to great lengths to have America commit our sons and daughters for this moral purpose, and we dutifully obliged.

I am quite sure that the Foreign Ministers of France and Germany slept soundly while the bombs fell on Kosovo without United Nations approval. Now, the people of Germany are roused to defend the sacred honor of the Security Council, the very same Security Council whose honor they flouted just five years ago. Convenience, not principle, seems to be Germany's guiding compass. Your constant opposition to America's efforts to remove a regime that has continually violated several, if not all of the human rights provisions within the United Nations charter and presents an increasing threat to democracies all over the world is nothing short of appalling. The dictatorship in Iraq far surpasses the practice of murder and oppression that ever existed in Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, your country insists on turning a blind eye to the atrocities and breeding ground for terrorism that fail to occur near the borders of old Europe.

Germany's continued indifference to the plight of the Iraqi people, its neighbors and those who fall subject to Saddam Hussein's evil rule defies explanation. The atrocities perpetrated under Hussein's regime are well documented by organizations such as Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights, Amnesty International, the Coalition for International Justice and even the United Nations. In fact, the former United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in Iraq, Max Van der Stoep, stated that "the brutality of the Iraqi regime was of an exceptionally grave char-

acter, so grave that it has few parallels in the years that have passed since the Second World War. . . . It is to comparisons with the obscenity of the Holocaust and Stalin's mass murders that observers are inevitably drawn when confronted with the horrors of Saddam's Iraq. . . . This is a state that employs arbitrary execution, imprisonment and torture on a comprehensive and routine basis."

The vile methods of torture inflicted upon Coalition prisoners of the Gulf War, Kuwaitis, Kurds, Shi'it Muslims, Iranians, Turkomans, and anyone else who dares to live a life contrary to the wishes of Saddam Hussein are well documented. Primitive executions, dismemberment, castration, hangings by barbed wire, the raping of women in front of family members and children, burning flesh with acid, finger and toenail extraction, boring holes into bodies with drills and the ignition of gasoline pumped into various orifices of the human body are routine measures employed by Hussein and his henchmen.

Yet your country continues to make every effort to block Hussein's removal and protect a despot whose country has the highest number of disappearances and displaced persons in the World. You callously refuse to acknowledge the documented destruction of life and repeated offensive military actions against surrounding countries since the 1970's. Your actions condone the blatant disregard of United Nations resolutions since 1991, and repeatedly make it clear that international law should not be honored. The statements made today and your acquiescence may forever undermine the peaceful objectives that are the foundation of international law and serve to entice future evils.

America will not follow Germany's lead and remain content to concern ourselves solely with problems that border our country. We will not allow economic investments and resource dependency to impede our future judgments to alleviate the suffering of others. The American people and my colleagues in Congress will not soon forget the rank hypocrisy and blatant disloyalty displayed by your country today, and I am confident that the free people of the world will also refuse to follow your misguided lead.

Sincerely,

CURT WELDON,
Member of Congress.

HONORING NAPERVILLE CENTRAL WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAM- PIONSHIP TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Redhawks, the Naperville Central High School women's basketball team, who this weekend brought home the Illinois Class AA State championship.

Under the leadership of Head Coach Andy Nussbaum, the Redhawks on Saturday tipped Chicago Fenwick in overtime, 63-59, to capture the school's first State title and the number seven ranking in the latest national rankings as compiled by USA Today.

Who are the Redhawks? They are Rachel Crissy, Seanna O'Malley, Lauren Grochowski, Megan McNaughton, Brittany Utrata, Liz Lawdensky, Tiffany Hudson, Courtney Peters, Erica Carter,

Denise Hill, Candace Parker, Megan Martin, Meredith Daniels, Christina Sahly, Molly Glanz, and Tara Hester.

Mr. Speaker, all of Illinois, and especially the city of Naperville, are proud of the girls' accomplishments, none of which is more impressive than posting an unblemished 35-0 record. This was the first perfect season for a Class AA women's championship team since 1998.

As many people in Illinois and across the Nation know, not so long ago the women Redhawks would not have had the chance to even lace up their sneakers. Thanks to the passage of title IX in 1972, young women and girls throughout America have come to benefit from the opportunities enjoyed for so long by young men and boys in America. It has enabled young women to participate in school sports, to learn the value of teamwork and competition, and to gain the self-confidence and skills that are so valuable in business and in other future careers.

Congratulations, Redhawks; and let me say, look out Redhawks opponents in 2004. Coach Nussbaum returns four starters, including the top junior player in the Nation, Candace Parker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: "Lord, my refuge, my stronghold, my God in whom I trust."

When the winds of distress swirl around us, Lord, or unsettling times demand determination, Members of Congress, as any of us in America, want to take refuge. We may seek refuge in consultation as we look for support from others. Or we may be tempted to blame others for our troubles. Rather than take refuge in excuses or in the shadow of others, we need to stand resolutely ourselves, claim You, O Lord, as our sure refuge, and act responding to Your guidance.

When as a Nation or as individuals our security is shaken or our vulnerability revealed, we may, like Adam, want to hide. We may be tempted to think the firing power of weapons is our greatest strength, or the power of money will protect us. But in all the battles that are fought, You alone, O God, are a lasting stronghold.

So it is: in God we trust now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, last week a Defense Department spokesman announced that the United States is preparing to use landmines in Iraq. What an insult to the 146 countries brave enough to sign the Landmine Treaty which forbids the use of landmines. Embarrassingly, the United States is not a signatory.

Landmines do not know the difference between a soldier and a child.

Instead of killing children, we need to educate them. Instead of seeding Iraq with explosives, we should plant seeds of peace and well-being worldwide. Instead of using landmines in Iraq, we should be cleaning up landmines in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, the use of landmines is a step in the wrong direction. There are alternatives to war. Our problem is we have not prepared for them.

HONORING PRISON FELLOWSHIP

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, in the 1990s we realized that tough sentencing for criminals reduced crime rates. But this year alone, roughly 600,000 of those prisoners will be released; and statistics show that over 60 percent of these parolees will return to prison within 2 years.

To combat this trend, Prison Fellowship, a faith-based group, was formed and began to offer job-skills training, drug treatment, and the opportunity to cultivate character and faith. The results have been dramatic. Just 8 percent of their participants have returned to prison within 2 years. It simply produces productive rehabilitated members of society.

But the forces of the left seek to undo the progress by suing Prison Fel-

lowship. Americans United for the Separation of Church and State have sued them because of this. The left needs to learn that faith-based programs work many times better than government programs. They are seeking to build a more healthy society.

UNANIMOUS SUPPORT FOR U.S. TROOPS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, over the weekend I joined with hundreds of Marines in my congressional district as they prepared to deploy to the Middle East. Many of their families asked me whether the American people will support them. They asked whether the polls that they read about reflect a lack of support for those who may be asked to fight for our freedoms in the Middle East.

Madam Speaker, I support the use of force, but I understand that there is a diversity of opinion on this issue. In America we have the right to agree, the right to disagree, the right to remain silent; but let no one believe for a moment that there is any division with respect to supporting our troops. Republicans and Democrats will go and fight for our freedoms abroad and Republicans and Democrats will stand by them at home. We cannot forget our support of those brave men and women, and I know that this Congress will not forget that for a moment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE ADMISSION OF OHIO INTO THE UNION AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF OHIO RESIDENTS TO THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 122) recognizing the bicentennial of the admission of Ohio into the Union and the contributions of Ohio residents to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 122

Whereas Ohio residents will celebrate 2003 as the 200th anniversary of Ohio's admission into the Union;

Whereas Ohio was the 17th State to be admitted to the Union and was the first State to be created from the Northwest Territory;

Whereas "Ohio" is derived from the Iroquois word meaning "great river", referring to the Ohio River which forms the southern boundary and a portion of the eastern boundary of the State;

Whereas Ohio was the site of battles of the American Indian Wars, French and Indian Wars, Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Civil War;

Whereas in the nineteenth century, Ohio, a free state, was an important stop on the Underground Railroad as a destination for more than 100,000 individuals escaping slavery and seeking freedom;

Whereas Ohio, which is known as "The Mother of Presidents", has given eight United States presidents to the Nation, including William Henry Harrison, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, William H. Taft, and Warren G. Harding;

Whereas Ohio inventors, including Thomas Edison (incandescent light bulb), Orville and Wilbur Wright (first in flight), Henry Timken (roller bearings), Charles Kettering (automobile starter), Charles Goodyear (process of vulcanizing rubber), Garrett Morgan (traffic light), and Roy Plunkett (Teflon), created the basis for modern living as we know it;

Whereas Ohio, which is also known as "The Birthplace of Aviation", has been home to 24 astronauts, including John Glenn, Neil Armstrong, and Judith Resnik;

Whereas Ohio has a rich sports tradition and has produced many sports legends, including Annie Oakley, Jesse Owens, Cy Young, Jack Nicklaus, and Nancy Lopez;

Whereas Ohio has produced many distinguished writers including Harriet Beecher Stowe, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Toni Morrison, and James Thurber;

Whereas the agriculture and agribusiness industry is and has long been the number one industry in Ohio, contributing \$73,000,000,000 annually to Ohio's economy and employing 1 in 6 Ohioans, and that industry's tens of thousands of Ohio farmers and 14,000,000 acres of Ohio farmland feed the people of the State, the Nation, and the world;

Whereas the enduring manufacturing economy of Ohio is responsible for 1/4 of Ohio's Gross State Product, provides over one million well-paying jobs to Ohioans, exports \$26,000,000,000 in products to 196 countries, and provides over \$1,000,000,000 in tax revenues to local schools and governments;

Whereas Ohio is home to over 140 colleges and universities which have made significant contributions to the intellectual life of the State and Nation, and continued investment in education is Ohio's promise to future economic development in the "knowledge economy" of the 21st century;

Whereas, from its inception, Ohio has been a prime destination for immigrants, and the rich cultural and ethnic heritage that has been interwoven into the spirit of the people of Ohio and that enriches Ohio's communities and the quality of life of its residents is both a tribute to, and representative of, the Nation's diversity;

Whereas Ohio began celebrations commemorating its bicentennial on March 1, 2003, in Chillicothe, the first capital of Ohio; and

Whereas the bicentennial celebrations will include Inventing Flight in Dayton (celebrating the centennial of flight), Tall Ships on Lake Erie, Tall Stacks on the Ohio River, Red, White, and Bicentennial Boom in Columbus, and the Bicentennial Wagon Train across the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes—

(1) the bicentennial of the admission of Ohio into the Union;

(2) the residents of Ohio for their important contributions to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 122, the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 122 introduced by my distinguished colleague from my home State of Ohio (Mr. REGULA) recognizes the bicentennial of Ohio into the Union and the contribution to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States.

The Iroquois Indians were the first to recognize the significance of the vast region of the Northwest Territory. Ohio is named after the Iroquois word meaning "great river."

The 2003 Ohio bicentennial celebration allows us the time to recognize the many contributions Ohioans have made to our country and the world. Because of its former canals, navigable rivers, railroads and roads, we are known as the Gateway State that provided for western migration. Our interstate transportation system is still one of the most used in the country, and Ohio is a powerhouse in the American economy.

We are proud of our native sons and daughters who have contributed to our great country. Ohio calls herself the mother of Presidents, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, William Howard Taft, and Warren Harding all native Ohioans.

As a native Daytonian I am most proud of Ohio's aviation heritage. Dayton's Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is the largest air force base in the world and is the place where Orville and Wilbur Wright perfected flight. Annually, the Air Force Museum at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base hosts a million visitors. In fact, Ohio boasts four significant aviation firsts: Orville and Wilbur Wright, first in powered flight; John Glenn, first man to orbit the Earth; Neil Armstrong, first man on the Moon; Judith Resnik, the first woman in space.

Ohio has been the home to 24 astronauts. In fact, Ohio's aviation history is recognized on the U.S. quarter for Ohio in the U.S. Mint series. But these

memorable facts are only the beginning of the Ohio's story.

This year of 2003, the 200th birthday celebration of Ohio's statehood, allows us a full year to reflect on our heritage and to remind ourselves of how fortunate we are to be proud Americans. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 122.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of this resolution recognizing the bicentennial of the admission of Ohio into the Union and the contributions of Ohio residents to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States.

Madam Speaker, this year the residents of Ohio will celebrate the 200th anniversary of their State's admission into the Union. They will celebrate the fact that Ohio inventors, including Thomas Edison, Orville and Wilbur Wright, Henry Timken, Charles Goodyear, Garrett Morgan, and Roy Plunkett, created the basis for modern living as we know it.

They will celebrate the fact that Ohio is the birthplace of aviation. It has been home to 24 astronauts, including John Glenn, Neil Armstrong and Judith Resnik. They will celebrate the many distinguished writers Ohio has produced like Harriet Beecher Stowe, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Toni Morrison, and James Thurber.

However, one of Ohio's most profound contributions to the economic, social, and cultural development in the United States is the intricate role it played in the Underground Railroad.

Ohio's governing document, The Ordinance of 1787, states that "There shall be neither slave nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime." The slavery that did occur in Ohio was in the outermost portions of the territory that did not become part of the State of Ohio.

The Ordinance of 1787 not only attracted those fleeing the perils of slavery to Ohio, but also attracted various groups whose ideology resonated with the State's anti-slavery sentiment. Quakers, Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians were among the groups who found themselves drawn to Ohio due to their opposition to slavery.

The Underground Railroad consisted of stations, places where runaways could hide, eat, and take refuge during the day. It was not a single route. It was a complex web of main and branch routes. Essential to navigating the Railroad were the conductors who served as guides to those travelers making their way to freedom. Ohio was one of the most heavily traveled States along the escape routes of slaves.

In addition to being a reasonable distance from north to south, Ohio provided access to Canada via Lake Erie.

Slaves were able to take advantage of Ohio's first commercial railroad. Many of the staff on the commercial railroads also served as conductors on the Underground Railroad.

Ohio and its citizens have carved out a rich place in American history, well deserving of our recognition. Therefore, I am indeed proud and pleased to join with my colleagues in celebrating the development of this great State as a part of the Union which we know as the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I do not have any further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the distinguished sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I first want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) on an excellent summary of the role of the State of Ohio in dealing with the issue of slavery. We are building a museum in Cincinnati, Ohio, which was the key spot on the Underground Railroad. And as you travel throughout Ohio, you will find a number of communities that will have a marker saying that this community was one of the stations along the way. So I think it is great that the gentleman gave the Members and the audience that watches C-SPAN an understanding of Ohio's role, and it is a proud one, in dealing with these issues.

Ohio is popularly known as "The Mother of Presidents." Our good friends from the State of Virginia like to take issue with that, but we claim eight in our State, one of whom served the 16th District of Ohio in Congress. That would be President William McKinley, who was also chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. And if you go next door to the headquarters of the Committee on Appropriations, you will see a portrait of James Garfield, who also served in Congress and as chairman of Appropriations.

Madam Speaker, I think our colleague from Illinois has touched on a number of the important people that are part of Ohio history. I do not know if he mentioned Thomas Alva Edison, who started what is today a great industry in terms of providing electricity, and certainly his contributions in progress and industry were a result of hard work. Thomas Edison used to say, "Genius was 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration."

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned John Glenn and his role. We are all very familiar with that. And so I think we in Ohio can take great pride in the part that our State has played in the history of this Nation's space program.

We have had a number of people in science who developed different things

that are important to all of us. The Invention Place is in Akron, Ohio. It tells the story of inventors in the United States. It is a hall of fame for inventors.

We have, of course, in Canton, Ohio the Football Hall of Fame. Many people are very familiar with that. And I would also mention that we have the National First Ladies Historic Site. It is the newest unit in the Park Service that tells how First Ladies have made a very great impact on the history of our Nation.

These are all things that give us pride in the State of Ohio and, since I did mention McKinley, I would add that as President of the United States he was perhaps the first one to recognize that the United States was no longer an insular nation, and he became a champion of international trade. He championed the Open Door Policy to China and many other issues involving trade. And of course as a result of Spanish-American War, the United States became a world player. And we know today that the world looks to, at least part of it, in this day and age, looks to the United States for leadership. But William McKinley made a very great impact on the path this Nation has taken from originally being very protectionist, very insular to that of a Nation that does set the challenge to other nations to follow suit.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution. It recognizes that Ohio has been a State since 1803 and as such has made many great contributions to our Nation's history.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR).

(Mr. GILLMOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution honoring the bicentennial of the State of Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Dayton (Mr. TURNER) for sponsoring this resolution which pays tribute to the contributions of Ohioans to the economic, the social, and the cultural welfare of this country. I think it could objectively be said that no State surpasses Ohio in terms of the contribution that our people have made to the development of this country.

It is truly a diverse State from the Ohio River in the South to Lake Erie on the North. It has big businesses, small businesses, agricultural, recreational destinations.

The Buckeye State has developed also one of the finest educational systems in the United States. It is home to over 140 respective institutions with at least one college university or branch campus within 25 miles of every Ohioan.

It is home to a number of unique and extraordinary people, fast, first, most and best in the country.

Our State has given the United States eight presidents, one of whom was from my district, Rutherford B. Hayes; 24 astronauts, including the STS-70 All Ohio Shuttle Mission; and a plethora of sports legends, statesmen, distinguished writers, and successful aviators, Orville and Wilbur Wright, just to name two. Also, Neil Armstrong from Ohio was the first man to walk on the Moon.

Fellow northwest Ohioan, Thomas Edison, who was born in my district, would invent the light bulb, the phonograph, the stock ticker, and the movie projector. The combination of Mr. Edison and the Wright brothers truly makes Ohio the land of light and flight.

Ohio also holds claim to having America's first shopping center, its first kindergarten, its first chewing gum patent, its first professional baseball team, and the first hot dog.

Van Wert, which is located in my district, was the site of the first public library in this country. A few of the firsts in my district, and this could be repeated in districts all across Ohio: In my district the Whirlpool Corporation in Clyde, Ohio, manufactures more clothes washing machines than any plant in the world. The Heinz plant in Fremont produces more ketchup than any place in the world. It produces enough ketchup to fill 3.2 million 14-ounce bottles every single day.

□ 1430

The R.R. Donnelley plant prints the most Bibles in the world. Arm and Hammer Baking Soda, in my hometown of Oldport, produces more baking soda than anywhere else, and we also have in my district in Tiffin, the world's largest manufacturer of porcelain toilet fixtures used by people throughout America.

Let me say that we are proud of our State. We are proud of what Ohioans have accomplished in history, and I would urge support for the resolution and say, happy birthday, Ohio.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my colleague from Navarre, for introducing this and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), my colleague from Dayton, who is a brand-new Member from the State of Ohio. This is the first bill I think he has done on the floor of the House, and it is always quite an experience for any of us.

I want to take this time to talk a little bit about the Buckeye State, the bicentennial of our great State. This event was especially significant to us in central Ohio because Chillicothe was one of the primary sites for the celebration since it was the location of the State constitutional convention and the first State capital.

In the 200 years since statehood, Ohio has been the birthplace of people who have literally changed the world, from Presidents to the Wright brothers to Neil Armstrong's first steps on the Moon.

The eight counties that make up Ohio's seventh district have produced Governors, U.S. Senators, some Congressmen, cabinet officials, military leaders, entertainers, and even saw the beginning of what became the 4-H clubs across the country out of Springfield, Ohio.

I know how much effort went into planning the many commemorative events for the 200th anniversary of the founding of our great State and the many different ways communities celebrated cross our heritage was a tribute to the diversity of our State. I think we have set a very high mark for future generations to top when the preparations begin for the 400th anniversary of the creation of Ohio in the year 2203.

Ohio is a wonderful area to represent. We have a great delegation, a great bipartisan delegation. We all work together for the benefits of the State. We are all Buckeyes, especially this year with Buckeyes at Ohio State being number one in the country, and we refer to ourselves as Buckeyes; and that is a tone that we have tried to set across the country as we talk to people about our great State and the Buckeye State.

Today, I just came back from Cincinnati where we talked about great waterways of the Midwest and the great waterway of Ohio, of the Ohio River, and of our northern coast which we call up in the Cleveland area, Toledo, all the way over to Pennsylvania. We are a great State. We have a great heritage and say happy birthday to the State of Ohio, and go, Bucks.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate 200th birthday of the great State of Ohio, I am proud to stand up here today to share with the American people why my home state of Ohio deserves a grand celebration and widespread recognition.

The name "Ohio" can be traced to the Native American word meaning "great" that was first used to describe the powerful river that marks our southern border. It was known as the Old Northwest at a time when Americans had no understanding of how vast our land truly was. This area drew independent and daring people of all walks of life who were in search of a new beginning. These pioneers picked up their life and settled on the beautiful river, fertile soil, rolling hills, and the lakes that felt like oceans.

There they founded a new state built on principles much unlike those in the other 16 states back in 1803. The State of Ohio would go on to lead the nation in public education by being the first to open its doors to women and African Americans. It would nurture some of the best American inventors, including the Wright Brothers, and boost eight of its citizens to the Presidency. Ohioans aspire to do great things and know no limits—just ask two of the world's most famous astronauts, Ohioans Neil Armstrong and Senator John Glenn.

Ohio has traditionally been a vanguard in the fight for opportunities and rights for women, and it recognized nationally for its leadership role in several major reform movements such as temperance, anti-slavery, and women's rights. Ohio played an important role in freeing the slaves, using the underground railroad to bring them to safety in the North. In fact, Ohio contributed more of its population to the Union Army than any other state.

Ohio Governor Bob Taft recently kicked off an eight month celebration of Ohio's 200th anniversary. These festivities allow all Ohioans to take part in understanding our state's history and marking it in their own special way.

I, along with my fellow Ohioans, am proud to salute our great state that has made an immeasurable contribution to the lives of all who know it as home, as well as our nation. Please join me in celebrating Ohio's Bicentennial to reflect on our state's proud heritage and abundant history. Happy Birthday, Ohio!

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to join my friends from the Ohio delegation on the House floor today to mark yet another special occasion for our home state. Several weeks ago, we gathered here to celebrate and honor the Ohio State Buckeyes' college football national championship. And now we're here to mark yet another significant and historic event for the Buckeye State: Ohio's bicentennial.

Ohio's heritage is rich, and its importance to the nation is immeasurable. Consider these bits of trivia: Ohio played a vital role in the American Civil War. Our state contributed more of its population to the Union Army than any other state. Ohio is the home of 8 U.S. presidents. In fact, between the years 1840 and 1920, Ohio natives won 11 of 14 presidential elections. Ohio is home to legends in America's space program. Not only do Neil Armstrong and John Glenn call Ohio home, but the Buckeye State also is the home to twenty-two current astronauts. And finally, Ohio is the birthplace of aviation. The Wright Brothers called Ohio home and this year will be the focus of a celebration very close to my congressional district marking 100 years of flight.

Today, in Ohio schools, scores of students are poised to lead our state into its third century, and if the past two centuries are any indication, the best is yet to come.

Madam Speaker, it has been an honor to represent my friends and neighbors in Ohio on the local, state, and federal levels during my time in elected office. I wish them and all Ohioans across our state the very best today and in the years to come. May our next two hundred years be as prosperous and exciting as the last two hundred.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 122, recognizing the bicentennial of the admission of Ohio into the Union and the contributions of Ohio residents to the economic, social and cultural development of the United States. I am proud to be a lifelong resident of the State of Ohio. Ohio, known as the Buckeye State, is the birthplace of aviation and home to eight United States presidents.

Ohio is home to the first astronaut John Glenn, and the great inventors Thomas Edison and Granville T. Woods. The first female physician, Elizabeth Blackwell is also an Ohio native.

Ohio was an integral part of the Underground Railroad. For many escaped slaves

Ohio would be the last stop on a long journey to Canada. Cincinnati is now home to the national Underground Railroad Freedom Center.

From humble roots in Ohio Dorothy Dandridge would establish herself as one of the greatest actresses in Hollywood, paving the way for a young girl from Bedford, Ohio, Halle Berry to become the first African American woman to win a Best Actress Academy Award. A native of Cincinnati, Ohio, Steven Spielberg revolutionized the movie industry with such movies as Jaws, E.T.: The Extra-Terrestrial and Jurassic Park and Indiana Jones.

Olympic gold medalist Jesse Owens took his first steps in Ohio as well as famous golfer Jack Nicklaus. Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Toni Morrison and Hugu Downs were famous Ohioans who mastered the power of the pen and became great contributors to literature. In addition, I would be remiss to not mention Garrett Augustus Morgan, who established the Cleveland Call and the invention of the nation's first patented traffic signal. History has been made in Ohio. Carl Stokes became the first African American mayor of a major city. His brother Louis Stokes would follow to make history as the first African American Congressman from Ohio, paving the way for me to stand before you today as the first African American Congresswoman from the State of Ohio. These great Ohioans and great Americans have helped to shape the fabric of this country. Through this celebration, we pay homage to their lives and legacies. I am honored to speak on behalf of the citizens of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio as we celebrate this Ohio bicentennial.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to join my Buckeye colleagues in celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Great State of Ohio. My thanks to the dean of our delegation, Mr. Regula, for introducing this resolution.

It's my great privilege to represent Ohio's Fourth Congressional District, a widespread and diverse region steeped in tradition that has contributed much to the rich history of our state.

Some three decades ago, my hometown of Findlay in Hancock County was honored by Congress with the designation "Flag City, USA." Nearby Arlington, Ohio, enjoys the title of "Flag Village, USA." The discovery of oil in 1886 contributed tremendously to the county's growth; Findlay is home to the headquarters of Marathon Ashland Petroleum, an oil refining and marketing leader to this day. It was about the Blanchard River—than called Mill Stream—that Hancock County's Tell Taylor reminisced in his 1908 song "Down by the Old Mill Stream."

Hardin County is known as the home of Jacob Parrot, the nation's first Congressional Medal of Honor winner in 1863. Employees at Ada's Wilson Football Factory hand-make well over one million footballs per year, providing the NFL's official game balls since 1941.

The Lima Army Tank Plant in Allen County has played a vital role in our nation's defense since the Second World War, when its fore-runner, the Lima Tank Depot, processed more than 100,000 combat vehicles for shipment overseas. The tank plant's contributions continue in this new century, with ongoing work on the new Stryker light armored vehicle and a new \$32 million Abrams tank upgrade program.

Logan County is famous not only for the nation's shortest street (20-foot-long McKinley

Street), but also the first concrete street in America. George Wells Bartholomew, Jr., constructed this street in 1891, posting a personal bond of \$5,000 to guarantee that the pavement would last for five years. That street carries local traffic to this day, and was declared a National Historical Civil Engineering Landmark in 1976.

Wyandot County's Old Mission Church is the oldest Methodist mission in the United States. Completed in 1824, the Church sits on the grounds of the Wyandotte Cemetery, a burial ground for the last Native American tribe in Ohio. The Basilica, and National Shrine of Our Lady of Consolation in Carey draws hundreds of thousands of pilgrims on a yearly basis.

Marion County is the site of the Warren G. Harding Home and Memorial, honoring our nation's 29th president. Marion, home of the Popcorn Festival and the Wyandot Popcorn Museum, also contains one of four branch campuses of The Ohio State University, 2003's national football champions. I am privileged to represent a total of three of OSU's branches.

Citizens of Shelby County take great pride in their magnificent 120-year-old county courthouse, which was recently added to the list of "Great American Public Places." Sidney, the county seat, developed a reputation as a railroad and canal center early in our state's history.

Residents of Mount Gilead in Morrow County rightfully take pride in the "victory shaft" that dominates the village's North Square. This stone monument was a 1919 gift from the federal government in recognition of Morrow County's support of World War I—its citizens purchased more war bonds per capita than any other county in the U.S.

Auglaize County is the birthplace of space pioneer Neil Armstrong and home to the Neil Armstrong Air and Space Museum. The county seat of Wapakoneta is a focal point of Native American history, serving as capital of the Shawnee nation in the late 1700s and early 1800s. Chief Blackhoof organized the migration of the Shawnee to Kansas in 1826, and afterward returned to Wapakoneta, where he died in 1831.

The Mansfield Blockhouse in Richland County is the county's oldest structure, built in the public square to protect early settlers from Indian attacks during the War of 1812. The medieval castle design of the Ohio State Reformatory, constructed in the late 1880s, landed it on the National Register of Historic Places in 1987, and has been featured in three major motion pictures. Mansfield was also the home of John Sherman, longtime House and Senate member from Ohio, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Republican presidential candidate, and father of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Malabar Farm in Lucas is the former home and workshop of Pulitzer Prize winner Louis Bromfield, drawing thousands of visitors each year.

A bronze statue in the town square in Urbana memorializes the 3,235 Champaign County men who fought in the Civil War, 578 of whom did not survive the fighting. Urbana University's Johnny Appleseed Educational Center houses the largest collection of Johnny Appleseed memorabilia and information known to exist. St. Paris, in western Champaign County, was a leading carriage-making center for much of the late Nineteenth Century.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud that citizens in each of the 11 counties I'm honored to represent are taking an active role in celebrating not only our state's bicentennial, but also the rich and vibrant histories of their own communities. Their dedication and devotion ensure that our state's future remains bright for the next 200 years and beyond.

I salute the efforts of all who have made this bicentennial year a great one for our great state.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Bicentennial of the State of Ohio's admission to the Union. I rise to honor the contributions of Ohio residents to the development of the United States.

On March 1, 1803, Ohio became the 17th state to enter the Union. From the invention of traffic lights and Teflon to the famous first flight at Kitty Hawk, Ohio has been the birthplace of many important advances in United States history. The nation's first interracial co-educational college, Oberlin College, was founded in 1833 in Oberlin, Ohio. The storied history of this great state is, perhaps, best demonstrated through the accomplishments of its amazing residents.

Ohio residents have contributed to many different aspects of United States history and culture. Inventors Thomas Edison and Charles Goodyear hail from Ohio. Well-known authors Harriet Beecher Stowe and Toni Morrison, as well as, poet laureate Paul Laurence Dunbar also come from Ohio. Ohio also has the distinction of producing more Presidents than any other state in the Union. Legendary comedians Bob Hope and Phyllis Diller, who have inspired millions to laugh, hail from Ohio.

Other noteworthy Ohioans include Doris Day, Clark Gable, Annie Oakley and Neil Armstrong. Ohio's contributions have not only been limited to academic and artistic pursuits. Many well-known athletes hail from Ohio also. World-renowned golfers Nancy Lopez and Jack Nicklaus are both from Ohio. African American track star Jesse Owens, who won four gold medals during the 1936 Olympics, grew up in Cleveland and graduated from Ohio State University.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of the Bicentennial of the admission of Ohio in to the Union, a state whose contributions to this great country cannot be overlooked.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Whereas, the people of Ohio are commemorating Ohio's 200th Birthday on March 1, 2003; and

Whereas, they will be celebrating the Bicentennial in Chillicothe, the original capital of the great state of Ohio; and

Whereas, the residents of Ohio have molded a strong tradition of family values and a commitment to a high standard of living for Two-Hundred Years; and

Whereas, Ohio, since its inception, has developed into a growing and prosperous community dedicated to its past and future generations;

Therefore, I join with the residents of the 18th Congressional District and all of Ohio in celebrating the Ohio Bicentennial.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I urge adoption of this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the mo-

tion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 122.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPROVED FIRE SAFETY IN NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to the need for improved fire safety in nonresidential buildings in the aftermath of the tragic fire on February 20, 2003, at a nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Whereas, on the night of February 20, 2003, a pyrotechnic display ignited a massive fire at The Station nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island;

Whereas 99 people have died as a result of the fire and an additional 186 people were injured in the fire, many of whom remain hospitalized as of the date of the submission of this resolution with life-threatening burns and other injuries;

Whereas the victims of the fire were residents of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and several other States;

Whereas the firefighters, police officers (particularly officers of the West Warwick Police Department who were the first to arrive on the scene), and medical personnel who responded to the fire performed heroically under horrific circumstances, and they risked their own lives to save many of the injured;

Whereas, at hospitals in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, doctors, nurses, hospital staff, mental health professionals, and other health care workers toiled through the night and in the following days to care for the injured, and they continue to provide world-class care to victims of the fire who remain hospitalized;

Whereas hospital care for victims of the fire was provided at Rhode Island Hospital, Kent County Hospital, South County Hospital, Fatima Hospital, Massachusetts General Hospital, Miriam Hospital, Roger Williams Hospital, Landmark Hospital, University of Massachusetts/Worcester Hospital, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Westerly Hospital, Shriners Hospital, St. Luke's Hospital, Memorial Hospital, Charlton Hospital, and Newport Hospital;

Whereas the local Red Cross, with 10 paid staff and over 400 dedicated volunteers, has played a critical role in offering comfort to the families of victims and coordinating services;

Whereas State and local officials have responded to the fire and its aftermath quickly, effectively, and compassionately, and the people of Rhode Island and the Nation are grateful for their efforts;

Whereas Governor Donald Carcieri of Rhode Island and West Warwick Town Manager Wolfgang Bauer have shown exceptional leadership under trying circumstances and their sensitivity to the families impacted by the tragedy is much appreciated; Lt. Governor Charles Fogarty and Maj. Gen. Reginald Centracchio, as Co-Chairs of the Emergency Management Advisory Council, have also played a crucial role in responding to the tragedy; and the Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency has impressively and effectively coordinated a myriad of State and local activities;

Whereas area funeral directors and medical examiners have provided outstanding service throughout the tragedy;

Whereas the staff of the local family resource center has helped the families of victims to access the services and information they need and provided care and comfort to hundreds of grieving family members;

Whereas the people of Rhode Island and concerned citizens across the United States have shown incredible generosity in response to the tragedy, contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars to victims' assistance efforts;

Whereas many local businesses have provided victims and their families with crucial services from food to transportation, members of the Rhode Island Bar Association and Rhode Island Trial Lawyers Association have offered free assistance to victims and their families with immediate legal issues, and community mental health centers and mental health professionals have provided critical mental health care to victims and their families and other members of the community;

Whereas Federal agencies, including the Social Security Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Small Business Administration, have offered assistance and expertise that has been extremely helpful to the State's emergency response to the tragedy;

Whereas the West Warwick fire is only the most recent example of how deadly fire can be in nonresidential buildings;

Whereas, in 2001, the last year in which full statistics are available, 80 people were killed and 1,650 injured in fires in nonresidential buildings, not including the victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001; and

Whereas, on February 17, 2003, 21 people were killed in a tragic stampede at the E2 Nightclub in Chicago, Illinois, and this tragedy and the West Warwick fire, which have deeply impacted persons throughout the United States, emphasize the critical need for enhancements in nightclub and concert hall safety; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) expresses its deepest condolences to the family members and friends who lost loved ones as a result of the tragic fire on February 20, 2003, at The Station nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island, and offers its hope for the quick and full recovery of those persons who were injured in the fire;

(2) expresses immense gratitude for the efforts of countless emergency response personnel, local, State, and Federal officials, health care providers, volunteers, businesses, and citizens who have been part of the response to this tragedy; and

(3) urges State and local officials and the owners of entertainment facilities to examine their safety practices, fire codes, and enforcement capabilities in light of this horrific tragedy and to take all necessary action to ensure that such a tragedy never befalls any community again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 85, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), expresses the sense of the House with regard to the need for improved fire safety in nonresidential buildings in the aftermath of the tragic fire that struck on February 20, 2003, at a nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island.

Madam Speaker, last month a great tragedy befell this Nation. Ninety-eight people were killed and nearly 200 more were injured when a devastating fire engulfed The Station nightclub that was hosting a concert in the suburban Providence, Rhode Island, town of West Warwick.

Stage props that sprayed pyrotechnics set on fire the acoustic wall behind the stage, and the fire spread across the nightclub ceiling at a terribly rapid speed. Apparently, the entire club was fully aflame in just 3 minutes. Many of the victims never had a chance to escape.

This unimaginable catastrophe was one of the deadliest nightclub fires in our Nation's history; and sadly, this incident seems so avoidable. I sincerely hope this event serves a final wake-up call to owners and operators of entertainment venues across the country. I trust all those in responsible positions will take an even closer look at safety features in their facilities, in order that this tragedy may not be repeated.

I would like to express my sympathy to the grieving families and friends of the victims. I congratulate the local, State and Federal emergency responders that worked tirelessly to save victims from the fire and continue to treat patients that suffer from burns and other injuries. I hope and pray that those who remain injured will experience a full and very quick recovery.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the passage of this resolution will lead us to take steps toward improving the safety of nonresidential buildings. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 85.

I thank my colleague from Rhode Island for introducing this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the resolution regarding the needs for improved fire safety in nonresidential buildings. This is a major concern with regards to the tragic fire at a nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island, on February 20, 2003, which killed over 90 people and injured about 200. It is almost unthinkable and unimaginable that such a tragedy could and would occur.

I also want to recognize a similar tragedy that took place in my congressional district in Chicago on February 17, 2003, at the E2 nightclub in Chicago's south side, where a stampede led to approximately 21 people being killed and more than 50 injured. This was a tragedy that could and should have been prevented if there were better fire and building safety codes implemented like wider staircases, more visible exits, and windows for air circulation.

In recognizing the tragedy in Rhode Island, I would like to take this opportunity also to extend my condolences to the families of the fire victims in Warwick and to the victims of the E2 nightclub in Chicago.

Madam Speaker, as lawmakers, we are responsible for ensuring the safety of our citizens, especially in public places. As a result, we should immediately pass this bill before there is any other tragedy, and I would want to urge all of those who have responsibility for safety in public places to do everything possible to assure that those buildings are, in fact, safe; that there is adequate opportunity for people to exit; and that we protect the lives of our citizens.

I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for introducing this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for introducing this important resolution, and I urge adoption of this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I appreciate his comments; and my condolences go to the families that lost loved ones in the Chicago tragedy as well. We share his pain in these two tragic events.

Madam Speaker, on the night of February 20, Rhode Island suffered a devastating tragedy. On that night, a massive fire, ignited by a pyrotechnic display during a rock concert, tore through The Station nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island, in my congressional district. That fire took 99 lives and left nearly 200 injured.

In any community, this tragedy would have been overwhelming, but in a small State like Rhode Island, when a closeknit town falls victim to one of the worst nightclub fires in the Nation's history, the impact is simply incomprehensible. Everyone in Rhode Island has a connection to one of the victims; and indeed, connections have been made all across New England and, indeed, the Nation.

I have introduced the resolution before us today to memorialize this horrible event and honor the victims and to express thanks for heroic efforts of so many emergency personnel, medical workers, community members, and government officials who have helped us through this tragedy.

Just as importantly, I was compelled to draw the attention of my colleagues to this fire in order to reinforce the urgent need for increased attention to fire safety nationwide. Federal, State and local officials, along with proprietors of nightclubs and other commercial facilities, must reevaluate safety regulations and their enforcement to ensure that this kind of tragedy never happens again.

If the West Warwick fire can serve as a wake-up call and lead to improved safety across the country, then these 99 lives will not have been lost in vain. It is the very least we can do to honor the victims.

As Rhode Islanders continue the healing process, I want to express my deepest condolences to those who lost loved ones in this horrible fire. There are no words to adequately express our profound sadness. Please know that they are in the thoughts and prayers of us all, and we will not let the lives of their husbands, wives, sisters and brothers, children, parents and friends be forgotten.

As of this afternoon, at least 40 people remain hospitalized, nearly half of them still in critical condition. I know my colleagues join me in offering up prayers for their quick and full recovery. They are fighting every hour, and they need our strength now more than ever. Our best wishes go out to them and their families as they weather the tough days ahead.

I would also like to express my immense gratitude for the heroic efforts of people and agencies from Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and elsewhere who have helped respond to this disaster. The firefighters, police, emergency responders who were first on the scene made a herculean effort under unimaginable circumstances; and we have them to thank that even more lives were not lost.

In addition, over a dozen hospitals in Rhode Island and Massachusetts have been caring for patients since this tragedy. The doctors, nurses, mental health professionals, and support staff of these hospitals have worked tirelessly to help the injured; and we are grateful for their service.

As usual, when tragedy strikes Rhode Island, our community has proven

strong, resilient and boundlessly generous. I want to recognize the countless volunteers who have put their lives on hold to help in any way they can. Likewise, many of our State's business community have come forward to provide food, shelter, transportation and much more to those affected by this event.

I would particularly like to thank the Red Cross and its scores of volunteers for all they have done to give comfort and assistance to those whose loved ones were lost or injured.

□ 1445

Rhode Island's Governor, Don Carcieri, has provided outstanding leadership throughout this ordeal and shown extraordinary sensitivity to the families involved, and I have personally heard from many of them how much they appreciate his efforts. West Warwick's town manager, Wolfgang Bauer, has worked hand in hand with State officials to help the people of his community through this event. Lieutenant Governor Charles Fogarty and Major General Reginald Centraccio, cochairs of the Emergency Management Advisory Council, have also played a crucial role in this crisis; and the Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency has impressively and effectively coordinated a myriad of State and local activities.

I would also like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), who is an original cosponsor of this resolution, for his assistance, his friendship and support through this difficult time, and, of course, Rhode Island's senior Senator, JACK REED, and Senator LINCOLN CHAFEE for their tremendous efforts and leadership. And I want to express my great appreciation to several Federal agencies, including FEMA, the Social Security Administration, SBA, HHS and ATF, for all of their support. Their involvement has been critical, and I look forward to working with them further in the weeks to come.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me address the issues of safety in our clubs, concert halls and other public places. As Americans have been reminded so painfully by the West Warwick fire, as well as the tragic nightclub stampede in Chicago just a few days earlier, we cannot relax our efforts to ensure that our fire and safety regulations are strong and effective and our entertainment facilities are in full compliance with them. As we now know all too well, to lose sight of the overall importance of safety can be fatal.

I have been greatly encouraged by the intense efforts going on across the country in recent weeks to revisit fire safety regulations and step up enforcement of existing laws. Our State and local officials are taking this issue seriously, and I am hopeful that the result will be improved safety in every city and town in America. I know that my colleagues are ready to offer whatever Federal assistance might be need-

ed to support these efforts and ensure that the horrific events in Chicago and West Warwick are the last of their kind.

In closing, I urge support of House Concurrent Resolution 85.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Illinois has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), in offering our heartfelt condolences to the families of the E2 Nightclub in Chicago for their tremendous loss. It is utterly ironic that the footage captured in Rhode Island of The Station nightclub on that terrible night was footage that was captured because a cameraman was following up on the local angle of club safety in light of what happened in Chicago. Those terrible images that we saw beamed across the country would not have been caught had it not been for our State trying to prevent what had happened in Chicago. How tragic it was that that is just what ended up happening.

Madam Speaker, it is with great regret that I stand on the floor of the House today to offer my sincerest condolences and heartfelt prayers to those who lost loved ones, to those who were lost, and those still recovering from the effects of the tragic fire in my State of Rhode Island. I know that there is nothing that we can say, no resolution that we can pass that will take away the consuming grief and the sense of loss that so many Rhode Islanders have felt and are feeling; but it is my hope that these condolences of the House, along with time, will help to heal those wounds.

I would like to say to my colleagues who have been watching the coverage of these sad events over the past days that you have no doubt heard several Rhode Islanders say that "everyone in Rhode Island is separated by one and a half degrees," a play off of the well-known "six degrees of separation" adage. Rhode Island is a small, but proud, State. There are fewer of us in Rhode Island than in Los Angeles, Dallas, Fort Worth, or Philadelphia. In Rhode Island, everyone knows everyone. Ask any Rhode Islander, and they will tell you their State is not so much a State as a community, a community where people are born, raised, educated, and eventually raise their own families in this place that will always welcome them home.

To my colleagues, and especially to my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who I thank for bringing this resolution to the floor today, I say that the atmosphere under which we are at this time

and place, where generations of American representatives have marked tragedies and triumphs in the halls of this Republic, today we mourn the worst of those disasters ever to afflict the people of Rhode Island. To date, we have lost 99 of our families, friends, and neighbors to this terrible tragedy. That is nearly half as many Rhode Islanders as were lost in the entire Vietnam War in our State of Rhode Island.

A disaster of this magnitude in a community like Rhode Island has tested the limits of our collective comprehension, resilience, and grief. While we mourn, we still hold out the hope, and offer our prayers, to the 190 men and women still fighting their injuries across New England, as many as 40 in the hospital. Their struggles will be difficult, the road ahead challenging; but the people of Rhode Island have proven that community togetherness and family can see us through anything. We offer them our support and encouragement today, and we promise that we will still be there in the months and the years ahead to ensure that we never forget that they are going to be living with these injuries for the rest of their lives.

Madam Speaker, but for the brave first responders who came immediately and professionally to their call to duty, many of those in the hospitals today would no longer be with us, and most assuredly the number of those still recovering from their injuries would be much, much higher. The emergency personnel on duty who rushed to the scene, to those who simply passed or heard through the grapevine about the tragedy and selflessly responded, the men and women of this House today say "thank you" to all of them. They worked without thought for themselves that freezing night, and afterwards, not only to free the trapped from the inferno, and tended through their own tears to the cries of the wounded, but long past the tragedy to tend to the emotional and psychological wounds that continue to inflict these victims.

Madam Speaker, what we ask of first responders in these situations is to be superhuman in the face of staggering human suffering. Most of us spend our lives doing our best to keep ourselves and our loved ones out of situations that the police, fire, and medical personnel rush into every single day, day after day. Their heroism in this tragedy does not go unnoticed. It might be added that with so much evil emanating from the events of 9-11, it is fitting to acknowledge that our State would not have been able to react as quickly as it had were it not for the lessons learned in that tragedy.

Also, the leadership shown at so many levels of government is inspiring to those of us who believe that there are indeed good and honorable people in government service. I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, in recognizing all those who he recognized in his remarks; but I too want to pay particular attention

to our new Governor, Governor Carcieri, who has shown tremendous leadership under pressure. The compassion and personal touch that he has brought to our State has truly been inspirational. More than any other person, the Governor has held our State together through this tragedy.

So while we continue to mourn for those who have walked on from this world and offer our prayers to those still fighting to return to good health, let us help to lessen their grief by showing our gratitude to all those who have helped them through this adversity.

There will be, unfortunately, no shortage of time to grieve for the mother that will not be able to open the presents with her children at the holidays. There is no shortage of time to grieve for the brother who will not walk down the aisle with his new bride. There is no shortage of time to grieve for the spouse who will not celebrate her next anniversary with her husband, the grandfather who will not see his grandchildren graduate from college, or the child who will take his first steps without his parents to see him. Many Rhode Islanders will have the rest of their lives for these somber memories. Now is a time for remembrance of how the human spirit, above all, arises in times of tragedy, because that is the only thing, besides the passage of time, that will help ease our current pain.

Unlike other no-less-painful losses we experience in the course of our lives, too many young lives were lost this horrific night. This incident has reminded me of the words that my father spoke at my cousin, John F. Kennedy, Jr.'s, memorial service. He said: "He was lost on that troubled night, but we will always wake for him, so that his time, which was not doubled, but cut in half, will live forever in our memory, and in our beguiled and broken hearts."

Madam Speaker, our hearts are broken; and those who are lost will no doubt live forever in our memory.

I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island once again for all the work that he has done representing his district through these difficult times. I know that the people who have entrusted their faith to him have been well served, and I appreciate this opportunity to rise in support of his resolution and strongly urge my colleagues to give it the support that it deserves.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to commend both the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) for bringing this great tragedy to our attention.

I also want to join with them in commending all of those who rose to the occasion, the policemen; the firemen; the Red Cross; emergency medical services personnel; mental health centers, crisis counselors; and even undertakers in my town, like Leak and Sons

Funeral Home, who buried seven people without cost and greatly reduced the cost for an eighth person; radio stations; Salem Baptist Church, New Mount Pilgrim Baptist Church; the Push Rainbow; WGCI Radio; and all of those who have contributed in setting up educational funds for the children of those whose parents lost their lives in the E2 tragedy.

Our country has a tendency to rise up when there is a special need, and I commend all of those who took note of the tragedy in Rhode Island, as well as the tragedy at the E2 in Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 85.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN AT WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY IN MAY 2003 IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 441) to amend Public Law 107-10 to authorize a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2003 in Geneva, Switzerland, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 107-10.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 1(a) of Public Law 107-10 (115 Stat. 17) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(14) The government of Taiwan, in response to an appeal from the United Nations and the United States for resources to control the spread of HIV/AIDS, donated \$1,000,000 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria."

(b) PLAN.—Section 1(b)(1) of Public Law 107-10 (115 Stat. 17) is amended by striking "May 2002" and inserting "May 2003".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to express my strong support for this legislation, Madam Speaker. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), has worked long and hard to make Taiwan's participation in the WHO a reality, and we also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his leadership in this area as well. As in years past, I am pleased to join with them in this effort.

The good people of Taiwan have a great deal to offer the international community. It is terribly unfortunate that even though Taiwan's achievements in the medical fields are substantial, and it has expressed a repeated willingness to assist both financially and technically in WHO activities, it has not been allowed to do so because of strenuous opposition from the Communist Chinese dictatorship.

My colleagues may recall the travesty that occurred back in 1998, when Taiwan suffered from a serious entovirus outbreak which killed 70 Taiwanese children and infected more than a thousand.

□ 1500

The WHO was unable to help.

In 1999, a tragic earthquake in Taiwan claimed more than 2,000 lives. Sadly, we learned in published news reports that the People's Republic of China demanded that any aid for Taiwan provided by the United Nations and the Red Cross receive prior approval from the dictators in Beijing. Yet when other nations face similar crises, Taiwan stands ready to help.

Our friends in Taiwan were among the first to offer assistance to the victims of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on our Nation. They provided generous humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan. They have been leaders in addressing global health issues and as this legislation notes, "The government of Taiwan, in response to an appeal of the United Nations and from the United States for resources to control the spread of HIV/AIDS, donated \$1 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria."

Madam Speaker, many of us have been disappointed by our government's lack of effort to assist Taiwan in its attempts to obtain WHO observer status at the annual World Health Assembly in Geneva. We have expressed our concerns to the State Department, and most recently, a bipartisan group of 64 Members of this body sought the personal assistance of Secretary Powell in this matter. We are hopeful that our delegation to the upcoming Geneva conference will stand strongly in favor of Taiwan's candidacy.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the

gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and also the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his prompt consideration of this bill in the Committee on International Relations. We have been working quite some time for this, and I thank Members for continuing to work on this important issue. I urge adoption of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 441, and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well. I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for his persistence in pushing for Taiwan's observer status at the World Health Organization. I also wish to acknowledge the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) on this critically important subject, and that of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Madam Speaker, by battling the spread of infectious diseases and increasing the quality of health care to the global community, the World Health Organization makes a significant contribution to our national security. As we meet in this Chamber today, the WHO is dealing with an outbreak of Ebola in Africa, implementing new strategies to stop the spread of the deadly HIV/AIDS virus, and teaching the developing world how to stop the transmission of tuberculosis.

Madam Speaker, the fight for quality health care around the globe will never cease. As a result, the World Health Organization and its member countries must look for help from every nation to strengthen the work of the organization. Unfortunately, strong and consistent opposition from the Chinese government in Beijing has repeatedly stopped the people of Taiwan from contributing to the work of the WHO.

It is true that observer status for Taiwan will not come easy. Beijing holds sway over many WHO members, but the facts in support of Taiwan's case are clear and compelling, and support will undoubtedly build over time with active American engagement. Taiwan is one of our strongest allies in the Asia Pacific region. It is a beacon of democracy for people around the globe.

Taiwan has the resources and the expertise to make a significant contribution to the work of the World Health Organization. The case for Taiwan as a member of WHO is clear and compelling, and I hope our administration will actively support this important initiative. I strongly support H.R. 441. I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today, I join my colleagues in support of H.R. 441 authorizing a U.S. plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2003 in Geneva. I want to thank Congressman Sherrod Brown for his continued commitment to this cause.

The Constitution of the World Health Organization states, "the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition." Taiwan's participation in the organization advances this principle.

Taiwan has made many positive contributions that benefit our country and help the international community attain the health goals set by the World Health Organization. Advancing Taiwan's participation in the WHO would provide the people of Taiwan more opportunities to participate in international health initiatives.

Taiwan's willingness to come to the aid of the people of El Salvador in the wake of the devastating earthquake in January 2001 is indicative of their commitment to global health. In the days following the earthquake, the Taiwanese government sent 2 rescue teams that included emergency, medical and engineering specialists to assist in the rescue and recovery efforts. In addition, the Taiwanese government donated \$200,000 in relief aid to the Salvadoran government.

The WHO Constitution also states, "the health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security and is dependent upon the fullest co-operation of individuals and States." In advancing the participation of Taiwan in the WHO, we are increasing global cooperation to address the pressing health concerns of our time. I strongly commend H.R. 441 to my colleagues and urge its passage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 441, and I would like to thank my colleagues on the International Relations Committee and the Congressional Taiwan Caucus for their support as well.

For the past few years, we have been pushing for Taiwan's observer status at the WHO. I don't know about the rest of you, but I'm starting to experience déjà-vu on this issue. Congress has addressed this several times, and I will continue to raise it until we have a resolution.

The World Health Organization makes a major contribution to the international community each and every day. The WHO has programs to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, to support the development of basic health care services throughout the developing world, and to provide humanitarian aid to those in need.

In this growing struggle, the WHO and its member countries should be looking for help wherever they can get it. Unfortunately, Taiwan's efforts to obtain observer status to the annual World Health Assembly meetings in Geneva have been blocked.

While the Administration has indicated support for Taiwan's bid for WHO observer status, it is unwilling to match the rhetoric with action. The State Department argues that the majority of WHO members would never support observer status for Taiwan, and therefore the U.S. shouldn't make a concerted effort on Taiwan's behalf. Well I say, let's find out.

The Administration must make a concerted effort to ensure Taiwan's participation in the WHO. The bid may fail, but Taiwan won't be allowed to participate if we do not make the case of its involvement.

Taiwan is a strong, democratic ally. It has developmental and humanitarian resources that would make a substantial contribution to

the WHO's mission. The people of Taiwan are volunteering these resources to fight global epidemics, and we are turning them away at the door. They have demonstrated this time after time—in Haiti; in El Salvador; and more recently by contributing a million dollars to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria. The world needs all the help it can get. Taiwan is not asking to join the WHO as a state, but rather as an observer. The case for observer status at the WHO is clear, and the Bush Administration should make it happen.

I strongly support H.R. 441, and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support to H.R. 441, a bill to authorize the United States to seek observer status for Taiwan within the World Health Organization (WHO).

Every May, the World Health Assembly meets to consider the acceptance of new members to the WHO. Unfortunately, even as Taiwan is among the leaders in Asia in important health indicators, such as life expectancy and infant mortality, it is unable to contribute to the WHO.

While nationhood is a membership requirement, the WHO does provide observer status to such entities as the Vatican, the Knights of Malta, and the Palestinian Liberation Organization. As a self-governing and democratic island of twenty-three million people, and as a potential member with a great deal to contribute to the WHO, I strongly support WHO observer status for Taiwan.

As we once again approach the annual World Health Assembly, I urge Secretary Colin Powell and Secretary Tommy Thompson to work with our friends around the world to obtain WHO observer status for Taiwan. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 441.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 441, a bill endorsing observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Organization in May 2003. I thank my good friend, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for introducing the bill, and I look forward to voting for it.

Madam Speaker, over the years, this body has been divided on a variety of foreign policy issues. What the House has not been divided on, however, is its support for Taiwan, especially as it pertains to its status in the World Health Organization. The fact remains that Taiwan's exclusion from the WHO not only hurts Taiwan, but also the entire international community.

The WHO's constitution states that "the enjoyment of the highest standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition." Yet, the constitution of the WHO has been disregarded when the inclusion of Taiwan in the WHO, even at observer status, has been laid on the table. This time for this to change is now.

Few recall that Taiwan was an original member of the WHO, participating as a full member from 1948 until 1972. The United Nations' 1972 decision to award Taiwan's seat to the People's Republic of China resulted in Taiwan's replacement at the WHO. Since then, Taiwan has sought to be readmitted into the WHO at the same time it has built one of the world's most dynamic free market economies and become a leading technological and scientific population.

Tragically, the world community has never fully benefited from the medical advancements made by Taiwanese doctors and scientists because Taiwan lacks WHO membership. Taiwan enjoys one of the highest life expectancy rates in Asia, has relatively low infant and maternal mortality rates, and has eradicated major infectious diseases such as cholera, smallpox, and polio. Additionally, Taiwan's government was the first in the world to provide children with free hepatitis B vaccinations. Until the international community recognizes that each country in the world will benefit multi-fold from Taiwan's inclusion in the WHO, political pressure from the People's Republic of China will trump the spread of Taiwan's medical advancements.

Madam Speaker, health has no borders, and certainly neither does disease. Taiwan's 23 million citizens suffer every single time relief is delayed simply because Taiwan is not a part of the WHO. Likewise, the world community suffers each time its access to Taiwan's medical advancements is limited for the same reason.

Taiwan's readmittance to the WHO is long overdue. With passage of this bill today, the State Department is again given the necessary tools to push forward on Taiwan's request. H.R. 441 is not a political statement against the People's Republic of China. Instead, it is recognition of opportunity for the entire world community. The successes of Taiwan's medical experts must no longer remain locked in a chamber of politics, and access to these ideas must be extended to all countries.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. May we all look forward to a day when Taiwan is admitted back into the World Health Organization, an organization it helped build 55 years ago.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 441, a resolution to authorize a United States plan to endorse and obtain status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2003 in Geneva, Switzerland.

In response to an appeal from the United Nations and the United States, the government of Taiwan donated \$1,000,000 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Taiwan has also been a sovereign state since its founding in 1912. Although China has exercised control over Taiwan, Taiwan is a democratic and free society duly elected by the people.

As a sovereign state, Taiwan has acceded to the World Trade Organization and, despite the PRC's objections, I believe it is time for Taiwan to also obtain status as a member of the World Health Organization.

I fully support the intent of H.R. 441 and I also urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 441.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMEMORATING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF HISTORIC RESCUE OF 50,000 BULGARIAN JEWS FROM THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) commemorating the 60th anniversary of the historic rescue of 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust and commending the Bulgarian people for preserving and continuing their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 77

Whereas the people of the United States and the Republic of Bulgaria respect all faiths, including Judaism and Jewish culture;

Whereas during World War II, despite being allied with Germany, Bulgarians did not cede to Nazi pressure to fully enforce anti-Jewish legislation and resisted orders to deport their Jewish compatriots to Nazi concentration camps;

Whereas in the spring of 1943 the Bulgarian people succeeded in preventing the deportation of 50,000 Jews to such camps;

Whereas it is acknowledged with sadness that the deportation of over 11,000 Jews from Thrace and Macedonia, territories which were administered by Bulgaria at that time, to Nazi concentration camps, took place;

Whereas Bulgaria was the only European country during World War II to increase its Jewish population;

Whereas members of the Bulgarian Parliament, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, King Boris III, politicians, intellectuals, and citizens all played a part in the resistance to Nazi pressure to carry out the deportation;

Whereas March 2003 marks the 60th anniversary of Bulgaria's refusal to deport its Jews to Nazi concentration camps;

Whereas the Bulgarian people today preserve and continue their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance; and

Whereas President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Simeon Saxe-Coburg Gotha are leading the United States and Bulgaria into a long-term strategic partnership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) commemorates the 60th anniversary of the historic rescue of 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust and commends the Bulgarian people for preserving and continuing their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance; and

(2) reiterates its support for strong ties between the United States and Bulgaria.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 77.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 77, a resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the historic rescue of 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust. This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON). H. Con. Res. 77 recognizes a relatively unknown but exceedingly important event in the history of Bulgaria and the history of Europe.

This resolution commends the Bulgarian people for their actions in 1943 and for preserving and continuing their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance. In the spring of 1943, the Bulgarian people succeeded in protecting Bulgaria's entire Jewish population from deportation and death in Nazi concentration camps. This happened despite the fact that Bulgaria was officially allied with Nazi Germany from March 1941 until September 1944. Bulgaria's legislators, clergymen, civic leaders, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens, through a series of protests and appeals, blocked Nazi attempts to deport Bulgarian Jews to death camps in Poland. The entire Bulgarian nation, the people, the Parliament, the King and the Orthodox Church stood united and confronted the Nazi terror. As a result, in that critical moment in history, not even one of Bulgaria's 50,000 Jews was deported to Nazi gas chambers.

In fact, I am told that Bulgaria was the only country in Europe in which the Jewish population actually increased during World War II. The Bulgarian people should be commended for saving their fellow countrymen and compatriots from the Holocaust. Bulgarians today should be proud of their predecessors' courage and heroism, and we recognize today this historic action that was taken. In a country and region of such long and deep history, at the crossroads of civilizations, we should also recognize the tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance in Bulgaria and what it might mean today for the Balkans, for Europe, for the Middle East, and for the world.

Madam Speaker, I would again like to commend Bulgaria and the Bulgarian people for this historic event, and I urge strong support for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. First, I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for his leadership on this important resolution. I also want to recognize the contributions to this measure of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Madam Speaker, just in the past year Congress has focused attention on growing anti-Semitism in Europe. Unfortunately, some European leaders have used the pretext of the Middle East conflict to justify this ugly phenomenon of the 20th century reappearing in the 21st century.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to commend an important U.S. ally, a future member of NATO, on what it did during the darkest hours of European history. Bulgaria's actions during the Second World War prove that a small nation can have a tremendously positive impact on humanity. In Bulgaria, the effort to resist the Nazi pressure to enforce anti-Jewish laws and to deport its Jewish citizens to death camps was undertaken by the full spectrum of Bulgarian society. Members of the Bulgarian Parliament, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, politicians, intellectuals, but most importantly, ordinary citizens all played a part in the resistance to Nazi pressure to carry out the unconscionable act of deportation to death camps.

March 2003 marks the 60th anniversary of Bulgaria's historic refusal to deport its Jews to Nazi concentration camps.

Some years ago at the initiative of my wife, she and I went to Bulgaria to express our appreciation for this heroic action of the Bulgarian people during the most difficult years of the Second World War. We met with a broad spectrum of Bulgarian people, and we had the opportunity of telling them that their little recognized heroic action is deeply appreciated by the American people and the Congress of the United States.

Sadly, Bulgaria was unique among its East European neighbors. In too many instances, the populations of other countries occupied by the Nazis turned against their Jewish compatriots or remained indifferent to their nightmare fate.

That is why today, Madam Speaker, I shudder when I hear the excuses used by some governments in Europe to explain the rise of anti-Semitism again on that continent. As we commend Bulgaria for this historic rescue, we must note that neighboring Macedonia is marking the tragedy of the deportation of over 11,000 Jews to Nazi death camps. This region was under the control of Bulgarian authorities at the time, but the Jewish residents did not have Bulgarian citizenship and were not saved from the Nazi death camps. They all perished.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the principal sponsor of the bill. I might note that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) is likely to become a grandfather for the first time within the next few hours.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today with the great honor of introducing a bill with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) to recognize the 60th anniversary of the historic rescue of 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust and commending the Bulgarian people for preserving and continuing their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance.

□ 1515

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) just mentioned, this indeed is a special day for me. It is a special day because I am so happy to tell the people of the world about the wonderful people that I have had the opportunity to be associated with in the Republic of Bulgaria. It is a special day because my daughter-in-law, Lauren, is in Bethesda right now. She is in labor awaiting the birth of our first grandchild. This is an extraordinary day on behalf of my son, who is an ensign in the U.S. Navy, Addison. We are indeed looking forward to the birth of Addison Graves Wilson, III. In fact, my wife is with the other prospective grandparents. My wife, Roxanne, and Julie and Craig Houston of West Columbia, South Carolina, are on I-95 as we speak coming up for the blessed event. We are just very grateful.

My association with Bulgaria, it is a bit unusual for someone from South Carolina to have an association with a country which does not have significant immigration to our State. It really started, and I need to give thanks to the late Lee Atwater, chairman of the Republican National Committee. He appointed me to be an observer for the first democratic elections that had occurred in decades in Bulgaria on June 10, 1990. I had the extraordinary opportunity of visiting Bulgaria. I do not want to give anybody the impression I am a world traveler, because it was my first visit to Europe. It was an extraordinary opportunity, though, for me.

I had gone to Bulgaria fully expecting to find the most slavish Soviet satellite. It was a country that was marked with a bitter dictatorship and a loyalty to the former Soviet Union that was unparalleled among the satellite countries of Eastern and Central Europe. When I arrived, it was, in fact, significantly different. It was like a country frozen in time. I found people who were really back to about 1939. It was an extraordinary circumstance of a country where the people were just terrific. They were very friendly, they

were very open, they were excited about the efforts that Ronald Reagan had made of peace through strength, the liberation of Eastern and Central Europe. I also found a country which I could identify with coming from the southeastern part of the United States, which is in the southeastern part of Europe.

I found a very friendly meteorological climate. The people were friendly. The geography was remarkably similar to my home State of South Carolina. They have beautiful beaches to the east on the Black Sea, there is a midlands very similar to where I represent in Congress, and then there are mountains to the west. It was a time to really feel at home. I met wonderful people. The first person who greeted me was a candidate for the National Assembly, Stefan Stoyanov. Stefan ultimately was elected to their parliament, the National Assembly. Then I had the good fortune of hosting him to observe our elections in November of 1990. This was hosted by various civic organizations: the Rotary Clubs, the Kiwanis Clubs, the Optimist Clubs, the Lions Clubs of the central part of South Carolina, the midlands of South Carolina. They raised money for Assemblyman Stoyanov to come visit. At that time it was an extraordinary election victory for Governor Carroll Campbell, who was reelected. Governor Campbell took the Bulgarian assemblyman to the stage for recognition on election night at the victory party. It was an extraordinary event.

I then had the opportunity to visit later that year with the democratically elected members of the National Assembly, thanks to the Free Congress Foundation and Mr. Paul Weyrich and, in particular, the late Dr. Bob Kriebel, who is the founder of the Kriebel Institute, which has worked so well to establish democracy in the formerly-Communist countries. It was an extraordinary opportunity to be what Dr. Kriebel called an agent of influence, and it was positive influence, to promote democracy.

I then returned several years later and saw remarkable change. Through the sister city program of the Columbia International Affairs Association, we have a sister city relationship with Plovdiv, the second largest city in Bulgaria. Columbia, the capital of South Carolina, is very fortunate to be associated with this ancient city. It was known as Philippopolis. It was known as Trimontium. I found the history of Bulgaria to go back to Roman and Greek times. It is just a phenomenal experience of wonderful people. I was very fortunate at that time to have my son with me, Addison, Jr., who then left that next week to be a midshipman at the U.S. Naval Academy.

In the particular bill today, I am very grateful for the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations. I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska

(Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe. And of course, somebody near and dear to me, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who has been a real leader. And the professional staff has been so helpful.

The rescue of the Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust. In the spring of 1943, a period when Jews across Europe were subjected to total extermination in the Nazi death camps, the Bulgarian people, politicians and civic leaders through a series of resolute actions succeeded in protecting their 50,000 Jewish compatriots from deportation to the death camps. Bulgaria was the only country in Europe to increase its Jewish population during World War II. This happened despite Nazi pressure and the fact that Bulgaria was officially an ally of Hitler Germany as part of the Axis from March 1941 until September 1944.

Despite the anti-Jewish legislation and the heavy restrictions of the rights of the Jewish population adopted by the Bulgarian Government and Parliament in 1941-1942, anti-Semitism was never morally accepted by the Bulgarian society. King Boris III and the majority of the members of Parliament only reluctantly followed Hitler's official policy, resisting the implementation of the anti-Jewish legislation and regulations in their entirety. As a result of Nazi pressure, in February 1943 a secret agreement was reached to start the secret deportation of Jews by cargo trains in the first days of March 1943.

Due to the prompt public reaction and the resolute intervention of a group of active citizens, church leaders and politicians, led by Deputy Speaker of the Bulgarian National Assembly Dimitar Peshev, the Minister of Interior Gabrovski was forced on 9 March 1943 to cancel the deportation orders for the Jews from several Bulgarian cities. The trains, which had been waiting to be loaded with Bulgarian Jews and sent to the concentration camps in Poland, did not depart. Unfortunately, about 12,000 Jews from Aegean Thrace and Macedonia, who did not at that time have Bulgarian citizenship and had been already driven out of their homes by the special forces of the Jewish Commissariat, could not be saved and were deported through Bulgarian territory to Germany. The horrible sight of train compositions packed with Jews from Thrace and Macedonia crossing Bulgarian territory had a tremendous impact on public opinion in Bulgaria and strengthened even more the popular resistance against deportation.

Later, in March 1943, 43 members of the Bulgarian Parliament from the ruling majority, led by Deputy Speaker Dimitar Peshev, addressed a bold and decisive letter to the then Prime Minister Filov in which they called a possible deportation of Jews an inadmissible act with grave moral and political consequences for the country. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church played a cru-

cial part in mobilizing public support against the deportation and exerting its influence on the government. Metropolitans Stefan in Sofia and Kiril in Plovdiv actively contributed to the campaign against state discrimination of the Jews.

The broad popular and civil movement in defense of the Bulgarian Jews culminated in May 1943 when the plan of deportation was finally aborted. King Boris III played a decisive role in this decision by not ceding to Hitler's increasing pressure and not allowing the deportation to happen. The King resisted Hitler's demands with the argument that the Bulgarian Jews were needed as a workforce in Bulgaria. At the end of May 1943, about 20,000 Jews from Sofia were sent to work camps in the countryside where they were assigned heavy labor duties and lived in miserable conditions; but they survived. Many other political and professional organizations and groups of intellectuals joined actively in this national effort. The credit as a whole belongs to the Bulgarian people who showed courage and strength in defending their fellow Jewish countrymen. Bulgarians today feel proud of the courage of their predecessors to save from deportation and death nearly 50,000 Bulgarian Jews.

I have seen firsthand the good will of the Bulgarian people as an observer of Bulgaria's first democratic elections in 1990, and I have witnessed the progress of Bulgaria's democracy away from communism. I commend the efforts of patriots like Prime Minister Simeon Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Ambassador Elena Poptodorova, Foreign Minister Solomon Pasi, Defense Minister Nikolai Svinarov, Deputy Chief of Mission Emil Yalnazov, and Bulgarian Ambassador to Greece Stefan Stoyanov for continuing important reforms and for leading their entry into NATO.

We are proud of our allied Bulgaria. As cochairman of the House Caucus on Bulgaria along with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), it is my privilege to introduce this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 77.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to commend my friend for his powerful and eloquent and thoughtful statement. I would like to add that it is no accident that as we speak, Bulgaria is standing tall with the United States at the United Nations at another critical juncture of history.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 77, a resolution recognizing and commending the Bulgarian people for a little-known, but extraordinary, historical fact. The resolution was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), and this Member is pleased to be an original cosponsor.

This resolution seeks to commemorate the 60th anniversary of a historic act of courage

and heroism: the rescue of the Bulgarian Jews from the Nazi Holocaust in 1943. In that critical moment of history, the Bulgarian people, from every walk of life, through a series of resolute actions, successfully stopped the deportation of Bulgaria's Jewish population to Nazi death camps.

Bulgaria was officially allied with Hitler Germany from March 1941 until September 1944, but anti-Semitism was never morally accepted by Bulgarian society. It is said that King Boris III and the majority of the Members of Parliament only reluctantly followed Hitler's official policies, resisting the implementation of anti-Jewish legislation and other restrictions in their entirety.

In February 1943, as a result of Nazi pressure, a secret agreement on the deportation of Bulgarian Jews to Germany was signed between Hitler's special envoy Dannecker and the Bulgarian Commissar on Jewish Affairs Belev. The plan was to start the secret deportation of Jews by cargo trains in the first days of March 1943.

Due to immediate public reaction and the resolute intervention of a group of active citizens, church leaders and politicians, led by the Deputy Speaker of the Bulgarian National Assembly Dimitar Peshev, the Minister of Interior Nikola Gabrovski was forced on March 9, 1943 to cancel deportation orders for Jews from several Bulgarian cities. The trains, which had been waiting to be loaded and sent to concentration camps in Poland, did not depart.

Unfortunately, about 12,000 Jews from Aegean Thrace and Macedonia, who did not at that time have Bulgarian citizenship and who had already been driven out of their homes by the special forces of the Jewish Commissariat, were deported through Bulgarian territory to Germany. The horrible sight of trains carrying Jews from Thrace and Macedonia crossing Bulgaria and strengthened even more the popular resistance against deportation.

Later in March 1943, 43 members of the Bulgarian Parliament from the ruling majority, led by the Deputy Speaker Dimitar Peshev, addressed a bold and decisive letter to the then-Prime Minister Bogdan Filov, in which they called a possible deportation of the Jews an "inadmissible act" which "grave moral and political consequences" for the country.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church played a crucial part in mobilizing public support against the deportation and exerting its influence on the government. Metropolitans Sefan in Sofia and Kiril in Plovdiv actively contributed to this effort.

The broad popular and civil movement in defense of the Bulgarian Jews culminated in May 1943 when the plan of deportation was finally aborted. King Boris III played a decisive role in this decision by not ceding to Hitler's increasing pressure and by not allowing the deportation to happen. Many other political and professional organizations and groups of intellectuals actively participated in this national movement.

The credit as a whole belongs to the Bulgarian people who showed courage and strength in defending their fellow countrymen. Bulgarians today rightly feel proud of the actions of their predecessors to save from deportation and death nearly 50,000 Bulgarian Jews.

Bulgaria should be proud of this historical event, and its tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance. Bulgaria's history should be recog-

nized, and its people should be commended. Bulgaria should be an example to a region that has been torn apart by so much hatred and violence over the past decade. Let Bulgaria's history be an example to the Balkans and Southeastern Europe. Let Bulgaria's history be an example to all of Europe today, East and West, North and South, Old and New.

Madam Speaker, on this occasion, this Member urges strong support for this resolution and would also particularly like to thank Bulgaria, and the Bulgarian people, for Bulgaria's exceptionally strong support and cooperation with America in the international war on terrorism.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 77, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RICHARD K. ARMEY ROOM

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 19) designating the room numbered H-236 in the House of Representatives wing of the Capitol as the "Richard K. Armev Room".

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 19

Whereas, at the end of the 107th Congress, Representative Richard K. Armev retired after 18 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives, including service as the Majority Leader for 8 years, the longest tenure of any Republican Majority Leader in 92 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the room numbered H-236 in the House of Representatives wing of the Capitol shall be known and designated as the "Richard K. Armev Room".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 19 designates room 236 in the House wing of the United States Capitol as the

Richard K. Armev Room. Former Majority Leader Dick Armev represented the 26th Congressional District of Texas for 18 years, and his dedication to the 26th district and to the State of Texas had no bounds. He represented the constituents with honesty, integrity, and was passionate about his fiscally conservative principles. I now represent this same district and will follow in the same spirit. The people of this district, the State of Texas, and our great Nation are better off as a result of Dr. Armev's leadership in Congress.

Former Majority Leader Armev was the first of his family to attend college. He rose from humble beginnings in rural North Dakota to the pinnacle of American government. His was not a path of privilege but of hard work, dedication and strong beliefs. He earned a bachelor's degree from Jamestown College, a master's degree from the University of North Dakota, and a doctorate from the University of Oklahoma.

In 1984, Dr. Armev was elected to his first of nine terms in this body. He quickly made a name for himself as someone dedicated to sound public policies based on conservative principles. During his time in the House, he was instrumental in passage of public housing reform, closing of obsolete and unnecessary military bases, and farm legislation reform, each of which saved the American people money and allowed the Federal Government to better serve the communities impacted.

□ 1530

Dick Armev was also a steadfast conservative who advocated fundamental tax reform and brought the implementation of the flat tax to the national stage. These achievements and ideas all came as all of Dick Armev's accomplishments came, through hard work, persistence and dedication.

In 1992, Representative Armev was elected to the position of conference chairman of the House Republicans, the top policy position within the Republican Conference. In 1994, when Republicans won a majority of seats in this House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years, Representative Armev was elected to serve as majority leader, a position he held for 8 years, one of the longest terms of any majority leader in the history of this body.

In addition to his leadership roles, Majority Leader Armev also served as cochairman of the Joint Economic Committee and as chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, which was responsible for writing the legislation creating the Department of Homeland Security.

The naming of Room 236 as the Richard K. Armev Room is a fitting tribute to a dedicated public servant. I support the legislation and encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 19 would designate Room 236 in the House of Representatives as the Richard K. Arme y Room. H-236 is located in the Capitol and currently serves as a meeting room.

Mr. Arme y retired at the end of the 107th Congress after serving 18 years in the House. He was born in Cando, North Dakota, in 1940. After graduating from the local high school, he attended Jamestown College in Jamestown, North Dakota. He received his Master's Degree from the University of North Dakota and his Ph.D. from the University of Oklahoma.

Mr. Arme y taught for many years, holding positions at the University of Montana, West Texas State University, Austin College and North Texas State University. While at North Texas State, he was the Chairman of the Economics Department for 6 years.

In 1992, Congressman Arme y became the chairman of the House Republican Conference, and in 1994 he became the majority leader.

Designating this room in the Capitol is an appropriate recognition of Congressman Arme y's civic contributions and his dedicated public service.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, this is a great pleasure for me. This is my resolution, and I cannot think of a prouder resolution and a more meaningful one to me to bring forward than this resolution here today.

A person's work here in Congress speaks much louder than rooms that are named after them or statues that may collect dust in the hallways. It is right and fitting and appropriate that we name this room after Dick Arme y, but I can tell you that the Dick Arme y I know cares very little about what room is named after him. He cares much more about the legacy he has left for his children and grandchildren and this great country we call America.

Some would say that the beauty of our democracy is that when somebody leaves the United States Congress they are quickly forgotten. In some respects that is sad, because we have some great Members who come through our body on both sides of the aisle, Members who go on to bigger and better things, some might say in the United States Senate or the other body as we refer to it, maybe down in the administration, maybe they go home and raise their family, open a business, teach school, whatever it might be. But the beauty of our system and our democracy really does lie in the fact that it is we the people, and that while one great Member passes, a new great Member can hopefully fill those shoes as we move forward.

Dick Arme y speaks often about something very simple that I happen to

believe is very profound. "Freedom works" is a slogan that he has coined, to some extent. It is a long way of saying we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It took a long sentence to get that out back in 1776, but today we can say it very simply as freedom works; freedom works in America, freedom works in our economy, freedom works in our workplace. Freedom may even work in Iraq. Freedom works in a lot of places, in a lot of places that we call America, and Dick Arme y has helped bring freedom to our country.

It is an unusual procedure to bring a resolution to the floor to name anything in the United States Capitol. We do so only under very unusual circumstances. If you walk through the halls, you will find many great leaders with their name on the door. I believe it is appropriate that we take a pause today and name a room. But the name that I think that Dick Arme y would find most appropriate on any room in this Capitol would be freedom.

The nice thing about this is that while I introduced this resolution, I did so with the full support of the Speaker of the House. I talked to him first, because you do not name rooms in the Capitol without talking to the Speaker. I also know I have the support of my entire conference. But what is even more enjoyable is to know we have the support of both sides of the aisle. Democrats who may have disagreed with Dick Arme y during his term had an enormous amount of respect for him, even though there was disagreement oftentimes, and that is true, I think, for many leaders that Republicans look to on the Democratic side as well.

This is a bipartisan resolution. Former leader Arme y is here in the Chamber today. I just want to say to my friend that this is as meaningful a public gesture as we can make, and we mean it with as much heartfelt wishes for you and your wife Susan, and the recognition that what you have done here has not been forgotten. Even though freedom works, our country continues, our democracy will flourish, and the Congress will continue to hopefully do good things that you will find enjoyable to watch from your new chair and your new seat.

Thank you very much for your service. We look forward to the opportunity when we can unveil this room some time in the near future.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa is quite correct that it is hard to leave a legacy. The majority leader himself pointed out how service in this body does take a fair amount from one's family and one's time with one's

family. I am aware of the fact that the retiring majority leader is expecting two grandchildren next month, and what a wonderful legacy it will be for those children when they visit the Capitol in years to come, to visit Room 236, the Richard K. Arme y Room.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 19.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 441, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 77, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Res. 19, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 122 and H. Con. Res. 85 will be postponed until tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN AT WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY IN MAY 2003 IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 441.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 441, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Culberson	Hoeffel
Ackerman	Cummings	Hoekstra
Aderholt	Cunningham	Holden
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Holt
Allen	Davis (CA)	Honda
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hooley (OR)
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Hostettler
Baird	Davis (TN)	Houghton
Baldwin	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoyer
Ballance	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Ballenger	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	DeFazio	Inslee
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Isakson
Barton (TX)	Delahunt	Israel
Bass	DeLauro	Issa
Beauprez	DeLay	Istook
Becerra	DeMint	Jackson (IL)
Bell	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Janklow
Berman	Dicks	Jefferson
Berry	Doggett	Jenkins
Biggart	Dooley (CA)	John
Billirakis	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Jones (NC)
Blackburn	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Blunt	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boehlert	Emerson	Keller
Boehner	Engel	Kelly
Bonilla	English	Kennedy (MN)
Bonner	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bono	Etheridge	Kildee
Boozman	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Everett	Kind
Boucher	Fattah	King (IA)
Boyd	Feeney	King (NY)
Bradley (NH)	Ferguson	Kingston
Brady (PA)	Filner	Kirk
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kleczka
Brown (OH)	Fletcher	Kline
Brown (SC)	Foley	Knollenberg
Brown, Corrine	Forbes	Kolbe
Brown-Waite,	Ford	Kucinich
Ginny	Fossella	LaHood
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Burns	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Burr	Frost	Lantos
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Buyer	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Gibbons	Latham
Camp	Gillmor	LaTourette
Cannon	Gingrey	Leach
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lee
Capito	Goode	Levin
Capps	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Capuano	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Cardoza	Granger	Linder
Carson (IN)	Graves	Lipinski
Carson (OK)	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Carter	Green (WI)	Lofgren
Case	Greenwood	Lowe
Castle	Grijalva	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Gutierrez	Lucas (OK)
Chocola	Gutknecht	Lynch
Clay	Hall	Majette
Clyburn	Harman	Maloney
Coble	Harris	Manzullo
Cole	Hart	Markey
Collins	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Combust	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Conyers	Hayes	Matsui
Cooper	Hayworth	McCarthy (MO)
Costello	Hefley	McCarthy (NY)
Cox	Hensarling	McCollum
Cramer	Herger	McCotter
Crane	Hill	McCrery
Crenshaw	Hinchey	McDermott
Crowley	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cubin	Hobson	McHugh

McInnis	Porter	Smith (TX)
McIntyre	Portman	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Price (NC)	Souder
McNulty	Pryce (OH)	Spratt
Meehan	Putnam	Stearns
Meek (FL)	Quinn	Stenholm
Meeks (NY)	Radanovich	Strickland
Menendez	Rahall	Stupak
Mica	Ramstad	Sullivan
Michaud	Rangel	Sweeney
Millender-	Regula	Tancredo
McDonald	Rehberg	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Tauscher
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Tauzin
Miller (NC)	Reynolds	Taylor (MS)
Miller, Gary	Rodriguez	Taylor (NC)
Miller, George	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)	Thomas
Moore	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Moran (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Murphy	Ross	Tiahrt
Murtha	Rothman	Tiberi
Musgrave	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Myrick	Royce	Toomey
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Towns
Neal (MA)	Rush	Turner (OH)
Nethercutt	Ryan (OH)	Turner (TX)
Ney	Ryan (WI)	Udall (CO)
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Udall (NM)
Norwood	Sabo	Upton
Nunes	Sanchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Nussle	T.	Velazquez
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Olver	Sanders	Vitter
Ortiz	Sandlin	Walden (OR)
Osborne	Saxton	Walsh
Ose	Schakowsky	Wamp
Otter	Schiff	Waters
Owens	Schrock	Watson
Oxley	Scott (GA)	Watt
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Pascarell	Sensenbrenner	Weiner
Pastor	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Paul	Shadegg	Weller
Payne	Shaw	Wexler
Pearce	Shays	Wicker
Pelosi	Sherman	Wilson (NM)
Pence	Sherwood	Wilson (SC)
Peterson (MN)	Shimkus	Wolf
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Woolsey
Petri	Simmons	Wu
Pickering	Simpson	Wynn
Pitts	Skelton	Young (AK)
Platts	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Pombo	Smith (MI)	
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—20

Akin	Gallegly	Serrano
Andrews	Gephardt	Snyder
Baker	Gilchrest	Solis
Dingell	Hyde	Stark
Doolittle	Johnson (IL)	Weldon (PA)
Farr	Nader	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Oberstar	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). The Chair would remind all Members that there are less than 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1853

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50 on H.R. 441 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series of votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COMMEMORATING 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF HISTORIC RESCUE OF 50,000 BULGARIAN JEWS FROM THE HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 77, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 77, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Clay	Garrett (NJ)
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gerlach
Aderholt	Coble	Gibbons
Alexander	Cole	Gillmor
Allen	Collins	Gingrey
Baca	Combust	Gonzalez
Bachus	Conyers	Goode
Baird	Cooper	Goodlatte
Baker	Costello	Gordon
Baldwin	Cox	Goss
Ballance	Cramer	Granger
Ballenger	Crane	Graves
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Green (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Crowley	Green (WI)
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Greenwood
Bass	Culberson	Grijalva
Beauprez	Cummings	Gutierrez
Becerra	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Bell	Davis (AL)	Hall
Bereuter	Davis (CA)	Harman
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Harris
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hart
Berry	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Biggart	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Billirakis	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Bishop (GA)	Deal (GA)	Hayworth
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hefley
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hensarling
Blackburn	Delahunt	Herger
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hill
Blunt	DeLay	Hinchey
Boehlert	DeMint	Hinojosa
Boehner	Deutsch	Hobson
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoeffel
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Bono	Dicks	Holden
Boozman	Doggett	Holt
Boswell	Dooley (CA)	Honda
Boucher	Doyle	Hooley (OR)
Boyd	Dreier	Hostettler
Bradley (NH)	Duncan	Houghton
Brady (PA)	Dunn	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Emanuel	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Isakson
Burgess	Engel	Israel
Burns	English	Issa
Burr	Eshoo	Istook
Burton (IN)	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)
Buyer	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Calvert	Everett	(TX)
Camp	Farr	Janklow
Cannon	Fattah	Jefferson
Cantor	Feeney	Jenkins
Capito	Ferguson	John
Capps	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Capuano	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Fletcher	Johnson, Sam
Cardoza	Foley	Jones (NC)
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Jones (OH)
Carson (OK)	Ford	Kanjorski
Carter	Fossella	Kaptur
Case	Frank (MA)	Keller
Castle	Franks (AZ)	Kelly
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (MN)
Chocola	Frost	Kennedy (RI)

Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomboy
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Andrews
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Dingell
Doolittle

Gallegly
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Hyde
Johnson (IL)
Nadler
Oberstar
Serrano
Snyder
Stark
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are less than 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1900

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD K. ARMEY ROOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 19.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 19, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, answered “present” 8, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot

Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Frost
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly

Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha

Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomboy
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—8

Baird
Berry
Filner

McDermott
Olver
Owens
Sanders
Slaughter

NOT VOTING—20

Akin
Andrews
Dingell
Doolittle
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gilchrest

Hyde
Johnson (IL)
McCollum
Miller, George
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Schakowsky
Serrano
Snyder
Stark
Stupak
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are less than 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1908

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I stayed in St. Louis to attend my pastor's visitation on March 11th and was absent for recorded votes.

Had I been present for those votes, I would have voted as follows on the following bills under suspension of the rules: H.R. 441—"yes"; H. Con. Res. 77—"yes"; H. Res. 19—"yes."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 11, 2003 at 4:18 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a report in accordance with section 1205 of Public Law 107-107.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL,
Clerk of the House.

PLAN FOR SECURING NUCLEAR WEAPONS, MATERIAL, AND EXPERTISE OF STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) and section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), I am providing a report prepared by my Administration which presents a plan for securing nuclear weapons, material, and expertise of the states of the Former Soviet Union and reports on implementation of that plan during Fiscal Year 2002.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 11, 2003.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2003

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL INDICTMENTS IN SIERRA LEONE

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a United Nations war crimes tribunal headed by an American in Sierra Leone indicted seven people, including rebel leaders and a powerful figure in that country's decade-long civil conflict.

The indictment is for crimes of murder, rape, extermination, acts of terror, enslavement, and attacks on humanitarian workers; and all, if not most of these crimes, are directly related to atrocities committed to gain control of and profit from conflict diamonds.

These indictments are an important and necessary milestone in the long road to securing justice and restoring the human rights of the people in that part of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, 75,000 people died in Sierra Leone. But not until one actually sees someone, this young girl that Congressman Tony Hall and I visited when we were in a refugee camp in Sierra Leone, when you see someone who had their arms and legs and hands cut off by rebels to scare and intimidate the local population to gain control, do these numbers mean something.

My colleagues might also know, as reported in the press, that the rebels, these people that have been indicted, have been selling conflict diamonds to al Qaeda that have been funding the al Qaeda efforts.

So we want to salute the men and women that are working for us in Sierra Leone to bring about these indictments.

[From the Associated Press Worldstream,
Mar. 10, 2003]

INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL INDICTS SIERRA LEONE REBEL LEADER

(By Clarence Roy-Macaulay)

Sierra Leone's international war crimes tribunal issued its first indictments Monday against seven former warlords, including imprisoned rebel leader Foday Sankoh whose followers gained infamy with a campaign of chopping off hands, legs, ears and lips of innocent civilians.

Also charged was Internal Affairs Minister Samuel Hinga Norman, who was arrested and cuffed Monday by police who surrounded him in his office in the capital.

Hinga Norman, the former deputy defense minister, orchestrated attacks by a pro-government militia of traditional hunters called

the Kamajors whose alleged human rights abuses during the country's 1991-2000 civil war included torturing and summarily executing opponents and recruiting child fighters.

Three others were also arrested Monday while two remained at large.

Sankoh, whose Revolutionary United Front launched a vicious insurgency to control the country's government and diamond fields in 1991, will be among the first to go to trial, said David Crane, the court's American chief prosecutor.

The rebels' signature atrocity was cutting off the appendages of civilians in a tactic to spread fear among opponents.

Sankoh has been in prison since being captured in early 2000 after his fighters gunned down more than a dozen protesters outside his Freetown home.

"Today the people of Sierra Leone took back control of their lives and their future," Crane told reporters. "The dark days of the rule of the gun are over."

Crane said crimes alleged within the indictments include murder, rape, enslavement, looting and burning, sexual slavery, conscripting children and attacking humanitarian workers and U.N. peacekeepers.

Crane did not reveal when the cases would be heard. Court officials have been reluctant to give many details in advance for fear of jeopardizing the safety of trial participants.

The court was launched by an agreement between the United Nations and Sierra Leone to try serious violations of international and Sierra Leonean humanitarian law since Nov. 30, 1996, when Sankoh's rebels signed a peace accord with the government that was supposed to end five years of war.

The peace deal was followed by a military coup and several more years of fighting until the end of 2000.

Also indicted Monday was Johnny Paul Koroma, a former junta leader who is wanted by Sierra Leone's government in connection with a failed January coup attempt—the first since peace returned to the country.

Koroma, who allied himself with Sankoh's rebel in overthrowing Sierra Leone's civilian government in 1997, is currently at large.

Since elections were held last year, in which Sankoh's rebels stood for parliament without winning a single seat, a shaky peace has emerged, protected by nearly 17,000 United Nations troops—the world body's largest deployment anywhere.

Sierra Leone's war crimes tribunal differs from those of Rwanda and Yugoslavia as it will be held in the country and have a mix of local and international prosecutors and judges.

The court is expected to operate for three years on a budget of just under US \$60 million paid for by contributions from about 20 countries, including the United States and Britain.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DELAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE TRUTH ABOUT SADDAM HUSSEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of misinformation going around about our good friend, Saddam Hussein, and I think that the American people as well as my colleagues need to know really what is going on, because a lot of people have not been paying attention to this.

For the past decade, Saddam Hussein has violated 16 separate U.N. resolutions. He has failed to account for 26,500 artillery rockets used for delivering nerve gas; he has failed to account for 5,000 artillery shells filled with mustard gas; he has failed to account for more than 3,000 tons of chemicals that could be used as weapons; and he has failed time and time again to honor his agreement on the no-fly zone.

Mr. Speaker, he has enough biological agents to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax, 26,000 liters, 1,200 liters of botulinum toxin, and a whole bunch of others. He has tried to procure uranium for nuclear weaponry, and he has failed to account for nearly 30,000 empty munitions that could be filled with chemical agents.

□ 1915

Yet, there are so many people, after all of these violations, who keep saying, we ought to wait, we ought to wait, we ought to wait. He is connected to the terrorist network. If we are not very careful, if we do not deal with him very quickly, he is going to produce these biological and chemical weapons, he is going to give them to one of his minions in al Qaeda or some other terrorist organization, they are going to come into the United States, and they are going to kill tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans. That is why we need to deal with him very, very expeditiously.

One of the things that concerns me so much is that we do not profit from history. Back in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Hitler, the Chancellor of Germany, said time and again that he wanted peace and he did not want to violate any neutrality treaties, and yet he violated the Treaty of Versailles. He went into the Sudetenland and got an agreement from the European allies

and said that that was all he wanted. And then he went into Poland after violating a nonaggression pact. And then he went into Denmark, and then he went into Norway, and then he went into Sweden, and then he went into Belgium, and then he went into Paris and France. And because the world did not pay attention to what was going on and they did not listen to Winston Churchill, who was the only voice who made any sense, 50 million people died. I want everybody to listen to that: 50 million people died because they did not pay any attention to what Hitler was saying and what he was doing.

Now, Saddam Hussein has at his disposal weapons of mass destruction, and he has hidden them for the past 10 to 12 years; and he has not accounted for them. For us and the Free World to keep our heads in the sand while this is going on is absolutely incredulous.

The President of the United States is doing the right thing. The only thing I would say to the President is if the United Nations does not start forcing him to adhere, Saddam to adhere to those U.N. resolutions, then why talk to them anymore? Mr. President, do what is necessary. Take our troops and invade Iraq from the north and the south, if possible, get rid of Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction, and send a signal to the world and the terrorists worldwide that we are not going to tolerate them. Do not mess with the U.N. anymore, Mr. President, because they simply are not with it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ANOKA TORNAOES

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Anoka Tornadoes on their victory on Saturday, March 8, in the Minnesota State High School Class AA Hockey Tournament.

The Minnesota State High School Hockey Tournament is one of America's preeminent high school sporting events, along with Indiana basketball and Texas football. The tournament was profiled in "Sports Illustrated" some years back. The Tornadoes finished 25-4-1, with a 3-to-1 victory over Roseville in the finals. This is their first State boys' hockey championship and one that will be especially memorable to the 13 seniors who ended their last game together with a victory.

Coached by Todd Manthey and Paul Talbot, both Anoka graduates, the Tornadoes out-shot Roseville 22-to-17 in a game that featured two head coaches

with sons who were senior captains of their respective teams.

Anoka placed four players on the all-tournament team: defenseman and coach's son Tim Manthey, goalie Kyle Olstad, and forwards Ben Hendrick and Sean Fish.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these fine students on their championship.

TRIBUTE TO BOYD STEWART

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2003, my boyfriend, Boyd Stewart, of Olema, California, in Marin County will celebrate his 100th birthday. Born on a dairy ranch in the rural town of Nicasio on March 16, 1903, Mr. Stewart has been active in ranching and community issues his entire life.

After graduating from the Nicasio Elementary School with a student body of 17, Boyd attended Tamalpais High School where he rode a horse to San Geronimo and then boarded the steam train to Mill Valley, where there were cows grazing in the town center. Later, he attended Stanford University, earning money as a relief milker at the Palo Alto dairies and doing far better than his peers who were mowing lawns for cash. He left Stanford to run the family dairy when his father was killed by a horse.

In 1923, Boyd married Joseffa Conrad, a music teacher whom he met on the steps of Tamalpais High School when returning to see a favorite teacher. Joseffa died in 1980 at the age of 78. Today, daughter Jo Ann Stewart, granddaughter Amanda Wisby, and great grandson Stewart Campbell reside at the family ranch where, by the way, the two women run the business.

Over the years, Boyd has been an advocate for progressive ranching practices which many of his peers greeted with skepticism. Early on, he realized that overgrazing could destroy the land they relied on and that sound environmental practices would enhance their work. Boyd worked closely with farm advisors from UC Cooperative Extension and continues to be a strong supporter of measures to preserve the beautiful open spaces of Marin County so that we can preserve agriculture and the community's quality of life.

In 1932, Boyd moved to the present Stewart ranch where he lives in a farmhouse that was built in 1864. In 1935, he began producing grade A milk which meets the purest standards for drinking. His daughter, Jo Ann, took over operations in 1950; and in 1972, the ranch switched from dairy cattle to beef.

Horses have also been a part of the Stewart ranch's operations. In 1976, Boyd won the Morgan Man of the Year Award for establishing a now defunct Morgan horse breeding farm at Point Reyes National Seashore.

As an early supporter of Point Reyes National Seashore, Boyd was an advocate for fair practices for ranchers

whose property was purchased by the government and then leased back for continued agricultural use. A small section of his property was purchased for the seashore in 1968, and the remainder became part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1974. He continues to be an active supporter of agriculture within the national seashore.

Understanding the value of connecting to nonfarmed communities, Boyd has been involved in Greater Marin County and beyond. As a prominent local citizen, he has occasionally had the opportunity to host visiting dignitaries to give them a taste of the West. Recently, for example, a soccer team from the People's Republic of China enjoyed a barbecue at the Stewart ranch at the invitation of China expert and former rancher Orville Schell. These young people got to know what it was like in beautiful Point Reyes. Team members still treasure their photos. They were decked in cowboy hats, and they were riding the Stewart horses.

Boyd has been an active member of numerous organizations such as the West Marin Chamber of Commerce, where he focuses on all aspects of civic life in West Marin. He was a board member of the Marin Humane Society, which named him Humanitarian of the Year in 1993. He left the group, by the way, when they stopped serving meat. He was also involved in the Marin Conservation League, American Jersey Breeders Association, American Morgan Horse Association, California Co-op Creamery of Petaluma, Borden's Company, and others including the Tamalpais Trail Riders where his granddaughter Amanda became the youngest member at the age of 10 days. The ranch's most recent award, California Excellence in Range Management, from the California Cattleman's Association, demonstrates the family's continued focus on land stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, Boyd Stewart's heartfelt commitment to the land, its natural resources, its agriculture, and the people who enjoy it has inspired several generations.

IN SUPPORT OF OUR ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Members rise in this House for Special Orders, each of them speaks to a particular audience. Some are talking to fellow legislators, some are talking to the folks back home, some are talking to interest groups, and some, quite frankly, are just talking to themselves.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do something very different, because tonight I rise to speak to our men and women in uniform, some of whom are a long way from home right now.

To these brave folks I say this: I know you hear some of the protests in Europe and even on our own streets and campuses. I know you hear the sometimes bitter anti-American and antimilitary rhetoric of these protests, and I know you see the faces of some of the celebrities who not only oppose our Nation's policies but, all too often, question the morality of your actions as soldiers and sailors and airmen and Marines. Please know this: the overwhelming majority of your countrymen support you 100 percent.

The voices of the protesters and their cheerleading celebrities represent only a vocal minority, one that gets public attention way out of proportion to the numbers they represent.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Nixon spoke many years ago of a silent majority. Well, on this issue, standing with all of you, the majority will be silent no longer.

There is no better evidence than the fact that a movement that I am proud to say has arisen and taken root in Wisconsin is taking off. This movement, launched by a couple of talk show hosts and friends of mine, Charlie Sykes and Jeff Wagner of WTMJ Radio in Milwaukee, is an effort to support you, the brave men and women of our armed services, during these challenging and difficult times.

It started with just Charlie and Jeff in their open letter in response to the notorious Not in Our Name antiwar campaign. But what started with these two men and a fairly simple statement of principles has grown and grown and grown. It is now a thriving movement in my area known today as In Our Name.

The In Our Name effort is dedicated to supporting our troops and our Nation. In Our Name is attracting enormous backing from the people of Wisconsin and, more and more, the people of America. This past weekend, downtown Milwaukee was the site of a great rally in support of our troops and of the In Our Name campaign. It attracted hundreds and hundreds of folks from all walks of life, folks who gathered despite falling snow and freezing temperatures. And as of this evening, about 42,000 people have signed on to the In Our Name letter, including myself and my wife.

It is a statement that I want to read here tonight. It is a statement that I feel belongs in the recorded history of this extraordinary time in our Nation, and it is a statement that you on the front lines need to hear.

"Let there be no doubt in your minds as you embark on this mission that you carry the hopes, the prayers, and the gratitude of your country with you. Every generation learns anew that freedom carries a steep price. You are paying that price with your courage and your commitment, no less than those who fought to liberate Europe, to defend freedom in Korea and Vietnam, and to combat aggression in Kuwait a decade ago.

"As our fathers and grandfathers fought against and defeated Nazism, fascism, and communism, our generation must confront terrorism. You have answered that call.

"We know that you neither wanted this war nor fired the first shot. The war against America began on September 11, 2001, with the murder of 3,000 Americans. You fight in their name. You fight in the name of our children and our children's children who will not have to face a world dominated by terror, and you fight in the name of each and every one of us who signed this petition below.

"We know that all war is brutal and ugly and dangerous, but we also know that the price of inaction is even worse. We have learned the lessons of history, that the fruit of appeasement is war on an even more brutal scale.

"You fight so that the world will not have to face the nightmare of a tyrant like Saddam Hussein armed with chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons which he can use to threaten, intimidate, and murder. You fight today so that others will not have to fight even more savage battles in the future.

□ 1930

"We know that you have seen the anti-war protests around the world and in your own country. But know this: Your country is behind you. You are our sons, our daughters, our brothers and sisters, our wives and husbands. You are the best this country has to offer. In the difficult hours ahead, as President Bush said, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America and America believes in you. You fight in our name. May God bless you, our troops, and may God bless America."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA IS LOSING ITS ALLIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in dismay at the self-inflicted isolation of our country and wonder if it is too late to recover from the most catastrophic failure in diplomacy in American history. We are left with no alternative to war, gradually each day even, though we have not been attacked and even though there is no claim of imminent attack.

War is the most serious effect of this failure but it is not all we have lost. Enough of the finger pointing and ally bashing. Us against the world is a completely unnecessary result when we have been dealing with a totalitarian tyrant like Saddam. We have been seized by the hubris of our own power, losing everything that matters to us in foreign affairs, especially at a time of global terrorism when we need each and every ally we can get. We are losing each and every one of our major allies. You can cite the small countries all you want to, but when you lose the permanent members of the Security Council, you cannot blink that, no matter who you are.

We have endangered our closest allies, beginning with England. Poor Tony Blair. He is permanently politically damaged now. He will be weakened in all he does. Pervez Musharraf, the most critical in our anti-terrorism allies, faces wholesale opposition at home. What in the world are we going to do if he falls?

We have thrown to the wind the spontaneous coalition that gathered around us after 9/11, and yet it seems that we believe it is all the administration's fault.

Actually, the President's approach sowed the seeds of its own destruction because he began by announcing an invasion strategy. Had he started with meetings and consultation with our allies, of putting proposals on the table, beginning with inspections, graduating with tougher and tougher action, he would have his coalition by now. In fact, he had to be convinced to consult at all. I remember his making fun of the notion of going to the United Nations until members of his own party, former officials of former administrations, advised that it was important to seek a coalition.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson of this wholesale failure of the greatest power left, with everybody running from it, amounts to you cannot be a world leader if you cannot convince others to follow. And the second lesson is that if you have the power, you do not have to flaunt it. Used skillfully, you can bring people to you simply because you are

the greatest power in the world. God bless our country. May we still be saved from this catastrophe.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY 108TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Clause 2 of House Rule XI, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following rules of procedure for the Select Committee on Homeland Security in the 108th Congress.

RULES OF PROCEDURE ADOPTED MARCH 4, 2003

1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Select Committee on Homeland Security ("the Committee") shall be at 9 o'clock a.m. on the first Friday of each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

The date, time, place and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall, except as provided elsewhere in these rules, be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing. The notice requirement may be abridged or waived in extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

The date, time, place and subject matter of any meeting, other than a hearing or a regularly scheduled meeting, shall be announced at least 36 hours in advance for a meeting taking place on a day the House is in session, and 72 hours in advance of a meeting taking place on a day the House is not in session, except in the case of a special meeting called under Clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI.

2. PREPARATIONS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Under direction of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, designated majority and minority committee staff, respectively, shall brief Members of the Committee at a time sufficiently prior to any Committee meeting to assist the Committee Members in preparation for such meeting and to recommend any matter which the Committee Members might wish considered during any meeting. Such briefing shall, at the request of a Member, include a list of all pertinent papers and other materials that have been obtained by the Committee that bear on matters to be considered at the meeting.

3. MEETING PROCEDURES

Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except that a meeting or any portion thereof may be closed to the public if the Committee determines by record vote in open session and with a majority present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken on such matters would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any rule of the House. The determination whether any such discussion or testimony, or papers and other materials in connection therewith, shall be presented in open or executive session shall be made by the Chairman in conformity with the rules of the House and these rules. Opening statements at any hearing, mark-up, or other meeting of the Committee or any sub-committee may be given by any Member who is present within five minutes after the hearing, mark-up, or

other meeting is called to order, in his or her discretion, in each case not to exceed three minutes. With the consent of the Committee, prior to the recognition of the first witness for testimony, any Member, when recognized for opening statement, may completely defer his or her three-minute opening statement and instead use those three minutes during the initial round of witness questioning.

One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except in the following circumstances, in which a quorum shall be a majority of the Committee: ordering a report; entering executive session; releasing executive session material; issuing a subpoena; immunizing a witness; and reporting contempt. Two Members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of holding hearings to take testimony and receive evidence.

In full Committee or subcommittee, the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time, provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to notify Members of the resumption of such proceedings. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of, and the votes cast in opposition to, such measure or matter, or any amendment thereto. If at the time of the approval of a measure or a matter by the Committee a Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the report to the House thereon, that Member shall be entitled to not less than three additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) to file such views, in writing and signed by the Member, with the Clerk of the Committee.

4. PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE TAKING OF TESTIMONY

Notice. Reasonable notice shall be given to all witnesses appearing before the Committee.

Oath or Affirmation. Testimony of witnesses shall be given under oath or affirmation which may be administered by the Chairman or his designee, except that the Chairman of the Committee may not require an oath or an affirmation where the Chairman determines that it would not be appropriate under the circumstances.

Questioning of Witnesses. Committee questioning of witnesses shall be conducted by Members of the Committee and such committee staff as are authorized by the Chairman or presiding Member. In the course of any hearing, each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the questioning of a witness until such time as each Member who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness. The Chairman, or the Committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority Members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side. The Chairman, or the Committee by motion, may permit Committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

Counsel for the Witness. Any witness may be accompanied by counsel. A witness who is unable to obtain counsel may notify the Committee of such fact. If the witness informs the Committee of this fact at least 24 hours prior to the witness' appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

Statements by Witnesses. A witness may make a statement, which shall be brief and relevant, at the beginning of the witness' testimony. Such statements shall not exceed a reasonable period of time as determined by the Chairman, or other presiding Member. Any witness desiring to submit a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings shall file a copy with the Clerk of the Committee, and insofar as practicable and consistent with the notice given, shall do so no less than 72 hours in advance of the witness' appearance before the Committee.

Objections and Ruling. Any objection raised by a witness or counsel shall be ruled upon by the Chairman or other presiding Member, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee unless a majority of the Committee present fails to sustain the ruling of the chair.

Transcripts. A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during a Committee hearing.

Inspection and Correction. All witnesses testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect the transcript of their testimony to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. The witness may be accompanied by counsel. Such counsel shall have the appropriate clearance necessary to review any classified aspect of the transcript. Any corrections the witness desires to make in the transcript shall be submitted in writing to the committee within five days from the date when the transcript was made available to the witness. Corrections shall be limited to grammar and minor editing, and may not be made to change the substance of the testimony. Any questions arising with respect to such corrections shall be decided by the Chairman. Upon request, those parts of testimony given by a witness in executive session which are subsequently quoted or made part of the public record shall be made available to that witness at the witness' expense.

Minority Witnesses. Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party Members on the Committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Contempt Procedures. No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its Members, met and considered the alleged contempt. The person to be cited for contempt shall be afforded, upon notice of at least 72 hours, an opportunity to state why he or she should not be held in contempt, prior to a vote of all the committee, a quorum being present, on the question whether to forward such recommendation to the House. Such statement shall be, in the discretion of the Chairman, either in writing or in person before the Committee.

Closing Hearings. Hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with Clause 2(g) or 2(k) of House Rule XI.

5. SUBPOENAS, SUBPOENAS DUCES TECUM, AND AFFIDAVITS

Unless otherwise determined by the Committee, the Chairman, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall authorize and issue subpoenas. In addition, the Committee may itself vote to authorize and issue subpoenas. Subpoenas shall be issued under the seal of the House and attested by the Clerk of the House, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman. Subpoenas shall be issued under the Chairman's signature or that of a Member designated by the Committee.

Provisions may be included in a subpoena, by concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, or by the Committee, to prevent the disclosure of Committee demands for information when deemed necessary for the security of information or the progress of an investigation, including but not limited to prohibiting the revelation by witnesses and their counsel of Committee inquiries.

A subpoena duces tecum may be issued whose return shall occur at a time and place other than that of a regularly scheduled meeting.

Requests for investigations, reports, and other assistance from any agency of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government, shall be made by the Chairman, upon consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or by the Committee.

The Chairman or the Committee may require any person who is unavailable to testify as a witness at any hearing to submit an affidavit comprising such person's sworn testimony for use at such hearing.

6. STAFF

Members of the committee staff shall work collegially, with discretion, and always with the best interests of the national security foremost in mind. Committee business shall whenever possible, take precedence over other official and personal business. For the purpose of these rules, Committee staff means the employees of the Committee, consultants to the Committee, and any other person engaged by contract, or otherwise, to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee, including detailees to the extent necessary to fulfill their designated roles. All such persons shall be subject to the same security clearance and confidentiality requirements as employees of the Committee under this rule.

Committee staff shall be either majority, minority, or joint. Majority staff shall be designated by and assigned to the Chairman. Minority staff shall be designated by and assigned to the Ranking Minority Member. Joint Committee staff shall be designated by the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, and assigned to service of the full Committee. The Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments, including appointments by the Ranking minority Member and joint staff appointments, to the Clerk of the House in writing, and such certification shall be submitted to the Committee for approval by majority vote.

The joint Committee staff works for the Committee as a whole, under the supervision and direction of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. Except as otherwise provided by the Committee, the duties of joint Committee staff shall be performed and Committee staff personnel affairs and day-to-day operations, including security and control of classified documents and material, shall be administered under the direction supervision and control of the Staff Director. Majority and minority staff appointed by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, respectively, shall be subject to the same operational control and super-

vision concerning security and classified documents and material as are joint Committee staff.

Members of the Committee staff shall not discuss or divulge (a) either the classified substance or procedure of the work of the Committee, (b) any classified information which comes into such person's possession while a member of the Committee staff, or (c) any classified information which comes into such person's possession by virtue of his or her position as a member of the Committee staff, with any person except a Member of the Committee, for any purpose, or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during or after the person's tenure as a Member of the Committee staff, except on a need-to-know basis, as determined by the Committee, and in such manner as may be determined by the House or by the Committee.

No member of the Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee unless and until such person agrees in writing, as a condition of employment, to notify the Committee, or, after the Committee's termination, the House, of any request for testimony, either while a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter, with respect to classified information which came into the staff member's possession by virtue of his or her position as a member of the Committee staff. Such classified information shall not be disclosed in response to such requests except as authorized by the Committee, or, after the termination of the Committee, in such manner as may be determined by the House.

No member of the Committee staff shall divulge to any person any information, including non-classified information, which comes into his or her possession by virtue of his or her status as a member of the Committee staff, if such information may alert the subject of a Committee investigation to the existence, nature, or substance of such investigation, unless directed to do so by the Committee.

The Committee shall immediately consider disciplinary action in the event any member of the Committee staff fails to conform to any of these rules. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff, criminal referral to the Justice Department, and notification of the Speaker of the House.

7. PROCEDURES RELATED TO CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE MATERIAL AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Committee staff offices, including majority and minority offices, shall operate under strict security precautions administered by the Director of Security of the Committee. At least one security officer shall be on duty at all times by the entrance to control entry. Before entering the office, all persons shall identify themselves.

(b) Sensitive or classified documents shall be segregated in a secure storage area under the supervision of the Security Director. They may be examined only in an appropriately secure manner. Copying, duplicating, or removal from the secure area of the Committee's offices of such documents and other materials is prohibited except with leave of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member for use in furtherance of Committee business. No classified documents shall be maintained or stored in the majority or minority offices. Classified information in any form that is not obtained in Committee hearings and is not the property of the Committee or the House shall, while in the custody of the Committee, be segregated and maintained by the Committee in the same manner as Committee records which are classified.

(c) All Members of the Committee shall at all times have access to all records of Committee hearings and all other records, data,

charts, and files that are the property of the Committee. In the case of any such materials that are classified, the Security Director shall be responsible for the maintenance, under appropriate security procedures, of a registry, which will number and identify all classified papers and other classified materials in the possession of the Committee. Such registry shall also be available to any Member of the Committee.

(d) Members who are not Members of the Committee shall have access to all Committee records as described in paragraph (c), in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and restrictions as Members of the Committee.

(e) Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to Committee staff members with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know, as determined by the Committee, and under the Committee's direction, the Staff Director.

No Member of the Committee or of the Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, to any person not a Member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, any testimony given before the Committee in executive session, or the contents of any classified papers or other classified materials or other classified information received by the Committee except as authorized by the Committee in a manner consistent with the provisions of these rules, or, after the termination of the Committee, in such manner as may be determined by the House.

Before the Committee makes any decision regarding any request for access to any testimony, papers or other materials in its possession or a proposal to bring any matter to the attention of the House or a committee or committees of the House, Committee Members shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine all pertinent testimony, papers, and other materials that have been obtained by the Committee.

(f) Before a Member, officer, or employee of the Committee may have access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service on the Select Committee on Homeland Security, except as authorized by the Committee or the House of Representatives or in accordance with the Rules of such Committee or the Rules of the House."

Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk as part of the records of the Committee. The Clerk shall make signatures a matter of public record, causing the names of each Member who has signed the oath to be available each day for public inspection in an appropriate office of the Committee offices.

8. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees of the Committee, with jurisdiction as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Border Security: border security including prevention of importation of illicit weapons, pathogens, narcotics, and other contraband; illegal entry by foreign nationals; land borders, ports, and airspace; integration of federal, state, and local immigration law enforcement; protection of highways, bridges, waterways, airports and air transportation, energy supplies, and other critical infrastructure from attack; preservation of critical government, business, and financial institutions; relevant oversight; and other matters referred to the Subcommittee by the Chairman.

(2) Subcommittee on Rules: study of the operation and implementation of the House

Rules with respect to homeland security; examination of jurisdictional disputes and overlap related to the Department of Homeland Security, and homeland security in general; consideration of changes to the House Rules, pursuant to Section 4(b)(3) of H. Res. 5, necessary to ensure effective oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, and homeland security in general; relevant oversight; and other matters referred to the Subcommittee by the Chairman.

(3) Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response: preparation for and response to chemical, biological, radiological, and other attacks on civilian populations; protection of physical infrastructure and industrial assets against terrorist attack; issues related to liability arising from terrorist attack; public health issues related to such attacks; disaster preparedness; coordination of emergency response with and among state and local governments and the private sector; homeland security technology; relevant oversight; and other matters referred to the Subcommittee by the Chairman.

(4) Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Science, and Research & Development: security of computer, telecommunications, information technology, industrial control, electric infrastructure, and data systems, including science, research and development related thereto; protection of government and private networks and computer systems from domestic and foreign attack; prevention of injury to civilian populations and physical infrastructure caused by cyber attack; relevant oversight; and other matters referred to the Subcommittee by the Chairman.

(5) Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism: prevention and interdiction of terrorist attacks on American territory; liaison and integration of the Department of Homeland Security with the intelligence community and law enforcement; collection, analysis, and sharing of intelligence among agencies and levels of government as it relates to homeland security; threat identification, assessment and prioritization; integration of intelligence analysis, and sharing of intelligence, with and among federal, state, and local law enforcement; preservation of civil liberties, individual rights, and privacy; relevant oversight; and other matters referred to the Subcommittee by the Chairman.

(b) Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be referred by the Chairman to the appropriate subcommittee within two weeks of receipt by the Committee for consideration or investigation in accordance with its fixed jurisdiction. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the Chairman may refer the matter as he deems advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the Chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement on the matter. In a subcommittee having an even number of Members, if there is a tie vote with all Members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full Committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee.

(c) The full Committee shall have general jurisdiction over all programs and activities of the Department of Homeland Security, liaison between homeland security agencies and programs throughout the federal government, and the Department of Homeland Security, state and local homeland security,

and such other matters within the jurisdiction of each subcommittee as may be referred directly to the full Committee by the Chairman.

(d) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be ex officio Members of each subcommittee to which they have not been assigned by resolution of the Committee.

9. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee Member showing any procedural or legislative measures considered or scheduled to be considered by the Committee, and the status of such measures and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of such revisions shall be furnished to each Member of the Committee.

10. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

No Member of the Committee or Committee staff shall travel on Committee business unless specifically authorized by the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, respectively. Requests for authorization of such travel shall state the purpose and extent of the trip, together with itemized expenses anticipated thereon. No preliminary arrangements for foreign travel shall be undertaken by any Committee Member unless such travel has been authorized in writing by the Chairman.

A report on all foreign travel shall be filed with the Committee Clerk within sixty calendar days of the completion of said travel. The report shall contain a description of all issues discussed during the trip and the persons with whom the discussions were conducted. If an individual with the Committee staff fails to comply with this requirement, he or she shall be subject to disciplinary procedures set forth in these rules.

11. BROADCASTING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, shall permit that hearing or meeting to be covered by television broadcast, internet broadcast, print media, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions and in accordance with the spirit of the purposes enumerated in the Rules of the House.

12. DISPOSITION OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

Upon dissolution of the Committee at the conclusion of the 108th Congress, the records of the Committee shall be deemed current records and, consistent with House Resolution 5 of the 108th Congress, shall not be delivered to the Archives of the United States but rather shall become the records of such successor committee as shall be designated by the Speaker.

13. CHANGES IN RULES

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Committee provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks)

UNITED STATES IS NOT ACTING ALONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I cannot resist responding to the previous speaker's comments.

I am appalled frankly by some of the statements that were made from that podium just a few short minutes ago. The United States of America is not acting alone. The United States of America has not failed in diplomacy. It is the United States of America by the use of force through the United States of America and its allies, including the British, the Spaniards, the Italians and many other countries on the European continent, that have forced Saddam Hussein to come up with the weapons that he has come up with so far for destruction.

The United Nations has tried unsuccessfully, unsuccessfully year after year after year after year, through inspections, through economic sanctions, through criticism, through 16 or 18 separate resolutions, and yet the fine lady stands up in front of this House and says that the way we need to start this is with discussions.

What has been happening the last 12 years? I will tell you what has been happening the last 12 years. Saddam Hussein has been very methodically building up his arsenal, and I intend later this evening to go over not just a broad allegation that he has got additional weapons of mass destruction, not just an additional, not just a broad allegation that he has utilized these weapons of mass destruction because we know, in fact, he has. He has gassed his own citizens. He used them in his attack against Iran. He had prepared to use them when he occupied Kuwait.

What did he do these last 15 years, 12 years? That is exactly what he has done. He has very methodically, as I said, built up an arsenal. And now we have some people in our own Chambers that stand up and say, we ought to go talk more. We ought to start the inspection process and eventually kind of ramp it up a little.

Where have they been? With all due respect to my colleagues, when does this end? When are we going to say enough is enough?

I hope this evening I am able to present you with some remarks, with some convincing evidence, persuasive remarks that will show you just how evil this guy is.

It is amazing to me as I look out at the worldwide press, I do not think by the way the worldwide population, but as I look at the worldwide press, their media is slanted towards building up the good character of Saddam Hussein and destroying the good character of George W. Bush and America. What my colleague failed to mention in her previous statements here is she blames

the United States for problems with our allies. Let me tell you, take a look on the our allies. We have good, strong, solid allies out there and we have good relationships with many of our allies out there, but the fact is we also are a leader. We are the strongest Nation in the world. We are not going around boasting about it, but sometimes it falls upon the shoulders of the strongest person to pull that wagon up the hill. You know, if you have horses on a team and you are trying to get that wagon up the hill and you have some weak horses, at some point you have got to replace them with strong horses. That is not to say anything bad about the weak horses. It may be, in fact, that those horses were not built to pull a wagon up the hill. That is what we have happening here.

We have the French who for political reasons because they do not have much of a military, who for political reasons have decided to advance their causes by being the worst critic of the United States, by being the worst critic, you find very few words in the rhetoric on the fine island of France, and I say island because they are isolating themselves within the European continent, you find from their fine words horrible criticism of the United States of America.

You never hear the French leaders talk about what the United States does for the world. Do you know if you take a look we have no reason to apologize for this country. This country feeds more hungry people than any other country in the world. This country educates more people and educates them to a higher level than any other country in the world. This country exports, it overflows with freedom compared with any other country in the world. This country produces the greatest inventions known to man in the greatest quantity of any other country in the world. This country allows more private property rights than any other country in the world. Our Constitution allows more rights for our judicial system than any other country in the world.

We have the best medicine. Some of the best medicine ever known to mankind is developed in this country. Open heart surgery. You take a look at what you have. Root canals. You take a look at it. It is the United States of America. And yet we have Members of our own body up here apologizing and condemning our own country for perceived shortfalls. And what is their source? What do they use as their source? They use as their source the spokesman for the French. They use as their source the spokesman for the Germans.

Why do they not use as a source the Americans who have been able to realize the dream that only America offers and that America on many occasions has gone to battle throughout the world to give other countries the opportunity so that they too can enjoy the life we have enjoyed.

If you want to apologize for being a leader, if you want to apologize for

being strong militarily, if you want to apologize for taking tougher action against Saddam Hussein, then move aside, then move aside, because the majority of the people in this Nation want this Nation to prevail when it comes to freedom. They want the United States of America to prevail when other countries need our assistance. They want this country to prevail, to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Would the gentlewoman or some of my other colleagues here, it would be interesting to pull out our comments about what you thought about Saddam Hussein when he invaded Kuwait. I would be very interested to see what your comments were about the French when they went down to the Ivory Coast last year, by the way, without the authorization of the United Nations, without even going to the United Nations to say they were going to the Ivory Coast with their military and the overthrow they did on the Ivory Coast. Where were my good colleagues when the French did that?

How can you stand up here on the podium and defend the French? The French are our allies somewhat. Keep in mind they are the ones that did not help us when we asked for overflight rights on our actions with Libya. Keep in mind, too, to my good colleague from the other State, keep in mind who built that military facility in Iraq. It was the French. Remember the one that the Israelites took out in a bombing raid, a very daring bombing raid about 15 or 20 years ago? That was built by the French.

I am amazed that Members of this body will stand up and act as if the United States of America is the black sheep, as if the United States of America should be shunned instead of talking about the great things this country has done, instead of talking about the bravery of 250,000 troops over there and a couple other hundred thousand throughout the world and all the troops at home that are supplying those troops over there, their dedication and their patriotism, to talk about a threat that is an imminent threat.

And do not kid yourselves, Saddam Hussein and his regime, it is a cancer, and you can go to the doctor and you can tell the doctor, Doc, I do not want to hear this announcement. I do not want to hear your prognosis that I have cancer. That is not what I want to hear, Doc. Let us start from the beginning and see if you can leave out the cancer part of it when you give your prognosis to me.

The doctor says to you, look, you can couch it any way you want. You can paint it any way you want. You can blame all your neighbors. You can have your neighbors blame you, but the fact is there is cancer out there and you better deal with it, because if you do not deal with it all you are doing is not eliminating the problem, you are passing the problem on to the next generation.

Do not all of us wish, even the gentlewoman who just spoke, do not all of us wish that we would have resolved this issue in 1990 or the first Persian Gulf War when we had the opportunity? And what stopped us from resolving the issue, from destroying that regime or taking out that regime in 1990 when we had the opportunity? What stopped us? It was not George Bush, Sr., that stopped us. It was the United Nations that said do not go into Baghdad. Stay out of Baghdad. Leave Saddam Hussein in power. And now look what we did. We have passed it to another generation.

I happen to be in the generation that it was passed to. And as a Member of that generation, I do not want to see it passed to the next generation. I want us to face up to this problem and our President has done a darn good job.

Remember, this country retains its sovereignty, despite what Annan says over at the United Nations, despite what he says, the sovereignty of the United States remains with the United States.

□ 1945

We have never shifted our sovereignty to the United Nations, and I want to speak a little more about the United Nations here in a moment, but the United States did not need to go to the United Nations. The French did not go to the United Nations for their recent action on the Ivory Coast. We were not required to go to the United Nations. In fact, many of my constituents have said why did we even go to the United Nations? Why did we not just go out take care of the problem and move on?

The fact is that our President, George W. Bush, who has been unfortunately roundly criticized by some of my colleagues, it was his decision to take this to the United Nations. It is George W. Bush, who I happen to think is doing a remarkable job in his leadership, he is our Commander in Chief. He is the one who has led the pursuit of every diplomatic and reasonable, he has got to be reasonable, but every diplomatic channel.

While my good colleagues were enjoying the weekend, where was our Commander in Chief? He was on the telephone talking to China. He was on the telephone talking to Japan. He was on the telephone talking to Russia. He wants this resolved diplomatically, but at least he has got enough guts that if it is not resolved diplomatically, he will resolve it militarily.

Thank goodness we have got the team that we have down there at that White House. Everybody in this Chamber, in my opinion, would take a second seat to a Condoleezza Rice. Everybody in this Chamber, with due respect to my colleagues, I include myself there, would take a second seat to Dick Cheney, our Vice President. Everybody in this Chamber would take a second seat to Colin Powell. Everybody in this Chamber would take a second seat to Donald Rumsfeld.

Yet, many in this Chamber think they know it all. I am not being overly critical. I am just trying to say after these remarks that I hear condemning the United States, maybe not condemning the United States, but saying that we have led the worst diplomatic disaster in history, oh my gosh, it is clear there is not an in-depth study of history in those kind of remarks.

Where is the United Nations? I want to talk a little bit about the United Nations. I want to talk a little bit about the French and Germans, and I want to answer some of the questions, and most of all, I want to read an article that I think is right on point.

I actually went through it the other night, but many people asked that I go through it again, and I look forward to that, but first of all, let me talk about the United Nations. Let us face it. Let us take a look at what the United Nations is all about.

It has 191 member representatives in it, 191, and not being critical of the other 190, but if we take a look at that pool, just by the nature of our culture, just by the nature of the environments that we grew up in, just by the nature of our traditions in our particular countries, just by the nature of the governments that are within our country, we are different people. There are inherent conflicts.

There are a lot of things that we can do together, and I am one of those people that, while I think the United Nations is a paper tiger when it comes to military action, I think the United Nations has a proper place in our society. What is a proper role for the United Nations to play?

Let us start out, I think the United Nations can be kind of the centralizing authority to give us the help and the distribution we need to assist countries that have starving populations. For example, when we have a problem in Ethiopia, I bet the United Nations can help us with that problem. When we have a problem in Somalia, after they drag our soldiers through the streets, we cannot call on the United Nations. They do not have that capability. We have overestimated, we have exaggerated the role of the United Nations and its capability to carry anything on of substance, even in a diplomatic forum, with the exception of some very specific duties, and let me give my colleagues another example.

The President covered it very well in his State of the Union Address. We have a horrible plague of AIDS throughout the world. We need to conquer that disease. The United Nations is a good institution to lead that battle. The United Nations is a good institution to help with resources for advice on farming, to provide agricultural resources and so on.

But do my colleagues not understand, the United Nations, not because it is inherently evil or incompetent or incapable, but the United Nations, just by the fact of its structure, just by the way it is built, just by the way it is

built, is not designed to be able to go into a country of mass destructions and face them down. The United Nations does not have the capability because of its membership to face them down. We cannot get that membership all put together.

Take a look at the United Nations. One of the biggest problems in the world that we spend a lot of time and resources on is human rights. This country leads the world in human rights, but what does the United Nations do? One of the countries that is one of the worst abusers of human rights and makes list after list year after year is Libya. What do they do at the United Nations? They name the Libya representative as the head of the Human Rights Commission. That is why they are ineffective when it comes to this type of international geopolitical action. We should understand that their role needs to be more targeted towards the things of which I spoke.

Let me say just a couple of words about the French and the Germans. I think the French are the shining example of hypocrisy. Let me quote from a recent Wall Street Journal editorial: But before we move on to war, says the editorial, let us pause to honor the grandeur of French hypocrisy on "the unilateral" use of military force. France seldom bothered to ask the United Nations or anyone else when it concludes its own interests are at stake. When a failed coup in the Ivory Coast last fall, and many of my colleagues probably do not even realize this, many of my colleagues probably could not identify with, and I am not being derogatory, but could not identify where the Ivory Coast is, but last fall the French sent troops down to the Ivory Coast because they had a failed coup, and let me go back to the quote: When a failed coup in the Ivory Coast last fall blossomed into a rebellion that threatened civil war, France never did get around to asking for a Security Council resolution. President Jacques Chirac also forgot to ask George W. Bush for his permission. Rather, he dispatched hundreds and eventually thousands of paratroopers and French legionnaires to contain the violence, to protect French citizens and to prevent the rebels from overrunning the country.

I would ask my good colleague, who had just previously spoken, would my colleague call the French's action on the Ivory Coast, would my colleague give them the same criticism she has just given the United States of America, that it is the lead example of the most horribly failed diplomacy or whatever the quote was? The French act when it is in their own interest. How ironic that they criticize the United States when the United States and its allies act in our interests, and I keep saying the United States and its allies.

With the worldwide media now, it is almost laughed off the table by my colleague who spoke before me. She says,

well, these little countries, these little countries in Europe that are allied with the United States, I forget exactly what she said, but the effect of it was, does not mean much. Look at the big players. Let me tell my colleagues, those little countries in Europe mean a lot to us, and those little countries in Europe, they happen to think they are pretty important to this. After all, their continent is pretty important.

Let me tell my colleagues, if we want to go just by geographical size and by population size, let us take a look in that order of the allies that I speak of when I say the United States of America, that the worldwide media has largely ignored as a coalition of the willing. Start off with the United States of America. Put on to it Great Britain. Put on to that the Spanish, Spain. Put on to that the Italians. Then we start talking about Hungary. We can start talking about Poland. We can start talking about many other countries.

In fact, I think the coalition that will be put together for this action, if Saddam Hussein does not unilaterally disarm, I think that coalition will come very close or, in fact, exceed the size of the coalition for the first Persian Gulf War. This is not, as my colleague said, and I did write this down, the U.S. against the world. What a misstatement. That is a misstatement. It is not the United States against the world. It is the United States for the world, and a big part of the world is with the United States of America.

In the United States of America we can take any example we want in history, no country in history has ever gone beyond its borders, as the United States has, for other countries. We can take a look at World War I. We can take a look at World War II. We can take a look at the Persian gulf. We can take a look anytime there is a disaster in the world, what kind of relief do we see? United States of America.

When people are starving and we are allowed to get aid in there, what do we see on those bags of flour? United States of America. We have got an awful lot to be proud of, and frankly, we can be proud of our President and this administration. He is our Commander in Chief, and I can tell my colleagues frankly, over the weekend I listened to people like Sean Penn, a movie actor. I listened to Neil Young, big time singer in my generation. I listened to one of my favorite actresses, Julia Roberts. These are very talented actors, and I am appalled that all of the sudden they think they have doctorates in foreign policy, and they think that the President should take second seat to them.

I looked at one of the papers today, the New York Times perhaps or maybe it was the Wall Street Journal, full page ad from people who call themselves writers, "We are against the war." Those people have not spent a fraction of the time that even my colleagues here on the floor have spent on

what we are dealing with here, and I hope they are paying attention this evening. I am sure they are not, but I sure wish some of them were paying attention this evening to explain away just exactly what Iraq is going to do with these weapons of mass destruction.

We elected our President, and President after President we put confidence in our administration and our leadership. They know a lot more than we know. My colleagues know a lot more than their constituents generally, simply not because we are brighter but because we have had classified briefings, because it is our job to know more. It is the President's job to know a little more about these foreign issues than some of our good actors that come out of Hollywood who stand up there on a stage and condemn this country, a country that has given them all the privileges that they enjoy. Tell me that Sean Penn could go anywhere else in the world and fulfill the American dream. We have got to act as a team here.

In regards to the Germans, I mean the French are getting a lot of political hay out of this. Jacques Chirac, his popularity polls have gone through the roof. He is able to dance on the stage without paying the band. He is able to enjoy the fruits, as he has for a long time, of the labor that the United States of America has put out there.

The French really are not a significant military power anymore. Where they have their power is in the Security Council. That is why they want to go through there because they have a veto, and frankly, I just came from Paris, I just came from visiting NATO meetings, and by going out and talking on the street, a lot of people in Germany and a lot of people in France, they think terrorism, the big threat is the United States. They do not see it as such a big issue, and I understand that if the French want to stand out of the battle, as they often do when the going gets tough, the French do not want to play. I can understand that. That is their nature. That is their character. I can understand that.

The Germans, a little different story, but I can still understand that, but there is a big difference between standing aside, stepping out of the fight, and standing aside and cheering on the opposition. That should not happen.

A lot of people want to do everything they can to get rid of Saddam Hussein except fight him. Everybody wants to think they can sweet talk Saddam out of his regime. It is not going to happen.

I hope that Saddam Hussein takes the chance, the last chance that is now being given to him by the United States of America and its coalition, and I hope that he disarms, but I kind of doubt that he will. I think it is possible he may go into exile, but the fact is it is the United States of America that has forced the United Nations to do something about it, and the United Nations in November accepted. They

adopted 1141 that did something about it, but when it came time to call in the chips, the United Nations, because in my opinion of the makeup of the United Nations, could not stand up and carry its own weight, and at that point, once again, the United States and the allies that can carry the weight need to step in.

□ 2000

Madam Speaker, I want to read a letter, and I spoke to this the other evening; but let me, first, Madam Speaker, get a time check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The gentleman from Colorado has approximately 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINNIS. I understand I have 35 minutes remaining, and I will yield back 10 minutes; so in my remaining 25 minutes let me begin by reading a letter, and I am quoting from Alistair Cooke. And as I mentioned the other night, I do not like to read from somebody else's script. I like to pull in quotes, and I hope I give credit to the quotes that are out there, but this is a very moving article.

We all know that history is a good study. It does not tell us exactly what will happen in the future, but any good history teacher will tell us that the failure to understand past history will certainly be a significant handicap to any kind of understanding of how to prepare for the future. There is no crystal ball out there that tells us about the future, but history gives us an advantage. This article, I think, reflects very accurately some history that I hope all of us will think about.

Let me read this, and I will quote throughout the article. I will leave the article periodically to make a comment, but I will tell my colleagues when I do that.

Mr. Cooke: "I promised to lay off topic A, Iraq, until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspector's report, and I shall keep that promise. But I must tell you that throughout the past fortnight I've listened to everybody involved in or looking on to a monstrous din of words, like a tide crashing and receding on a beach, making a great noise and saying the same thing over and over and over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare, a daymare, if you like. Throughout the ceaseless tide I heard a voice."

This is Mr. Cooke talking about his dream. He heard a voice. "I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man, Prime Minister Chamberlain, saying: 'I believe it is peace for our time,' a sentence that prompted a huge cheer, first from a listening street crowd and then from the House of Commons and next day from every newspaper in the land. There was a move to urge that Mr. Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

"In Parliament there was one unfamiliar old grumbler to growl out: 'I believe we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat.' He was, in view of

the general sentiment, very properly booed down. This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 the British Prime Minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler."

So leaving the text for a minute, in 1938, Chamberlain signed over Czechoslovakia to Hitler, much like Saddam Hussein. Give him what he wants. Appease him. Back down to what is good for the world. Back down in your own interest. But you need to cover that. A politician cannot back away without giving it some kind of cover, and Prime Minister Chamberlain said, "I believe it is peace for our time."

Now, going back to the script again, let me start: "This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 the British Prime Minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered. 'Oh dear,'" said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck, "He has betrayed my trust."

"During the last fortnight a simple but startling thought occurred to me. Every single official, diplomat, president, prime minister involved in the Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most of them unborn. So the dreadful scene I've just drawn will not have been remembered by many listeners."

"Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years but only 2 years before, when he broke the First World War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland. Only half his troops carried one reload of ammunition because Hitler knew that French morale was too low to confront any war just then, and 10 million of the 11 million British soldiers had signed a so-called peace ballot. It stated no conditions, it elaborated no terms, it simply counted the numbers of Britons who were 'for peace.'"

"The slogan of this movement was 'against war and fascism,' chanted at the time by every Labour man and Liberal and many moderate Conservatives, a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic as 'against hospitals and disease.' In blunter words, a majority of Britons would do anything."

And let me leave the script here. This is probably the most important paragraph of what I am reading, or one of the most important:

"In blunter words, a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him. At that time the word preemptive had not been invented, though today it's a catchword. After all, the Rhineland was what it said it was, part of Germany. So to march in and throw Hitler out would have been preemptive, wouldn't it?"

"Nobody did anything and Hitler looked forward with confidence to gobbling up the rest of Western Europe country by country, 'course by course,' as the growler Churchill put it."

"I bring up Munich and the mid '30s because I was fully grown, on the verge of 30, and knew we were indeed living in the age of anxiety. And so many of

the arguments mounted against each other today, in the last fortnight, are exactly what we heard in the House of Commons debates and read in the French press."

"The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, 'negotiation, negotiation.'"

Let me leave the text. Let me repeat this paragraph. The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, every time Hitler invaded a country, the French would stand up and say negotiate, negotiate.

"They negotiated so successfully as to have their entire country defeated and occupied. But as one famous French Leftist said, 'We did anyway manage to make them declare Paris an open city. No bombs on us!'"

"In Britain, the general response to every Hitler advance was disarmament and collective security. Collective security meant to leave every crisis to the League of Nations. It would put down aggressors, even though, like the United Nations, it had no army, navy or air force."

"The League of Nations had its chance to prove itself when Mussolini invaded and conquered Ethiopia. The league didn't have any shot to fire."

Some comparison. I leave the text. Some comparison to the United Nations.

"But still the cry was chanted in the House of Commons, the League and collective security is the only true guarantee of peace. But after the Rhineland, the maverick Churchill decided there was no collectivity in collective security and started a highly unpopular campaign for rearmament by Britain, warning against the general belief that Hitler had already built an enormous mechanized army and a superior air force."

"But he's not used them, he's not used them, people protested. Still, for 2 years before the outbreak of the Second World War you could read the debates in the House of Commons and now shiver at the famous Labour men. Major Attlee was one of them who voted against rearmament and still went on pointing to the League of Nations as the savior."

"Now, this memory of mine may be totally irrelevant to the present crisis. It haunts me. I have to say I have written elsewhere with much conviction that the most historical analogies are false because, however strikingly similar a new situation may be to an old one, there's usually one element that is different."

"And it may well be so here. All I know is that all the voices of the '30s are echoing through 2003."

Take a look at the history of the League of Nations. Take a look at what happened in 1938, when Churchill had to stand up and tried to convince the people that these weapons were being developed. Take a look at 1938 and see if you do not think you are seeing a replay when the French stood up every time Hitler invaded a country and said, negotiate, negotiate.

Well, now let us just move from that and let us just show some of the facts that I want to present. People have said, including the previous speaker, that, well, we need to start these negotiations. We need to be patient. We need to work through this. This is 13 years. Every resolution here, 678, 687, 707, clear down to 1284, every one of these resolutions Iraq has violated. Every one of these resolutions the U.N. stood up as if this was the last resolution because it was going to resolve it.

You know, if you signed a contract with somebody and you had this many contracts with an individual, and that individual broke every contract, every one of those you had with them, do you think that would give you a little history as to the next contract and how effective it might be?

We hear people say, well, Iraq is not a dangerous country. We have got Iraq contained. How contained did the world have Iraq when it gassed its own communities, the Kurds? How contained did the world have Iraq when it invaded Kuwait? Were they able to stop them? We were able to. The United States of America, leading the coalition, was able to push them back. But we could not stop the initial invasion. How about Iran, when Iraq started the war with Iran?

Take a look at these and take a look at the weapons he used. These are weapons of mass destruction. These are weapons that yesterday Saddam Hussein said he had, but today he denies he has them; and tomorrow, frankly, he will use them, in my opinion. He has the history.

Again, going back in history, again reflecting on history. Date: August 1983, mustard gas kills 100 people; October 1983, mustard gas kills 3,000 of his own people; February 1984, mustard gas kills 2,500 Iranians; March 1984, mustard gas, or Tabun, 50 to 100; March 1985, mustard gas; 1986, mustard gas; 1986, mustard gas; 1987, mustard gas; 1987, mustard gas; 1988, mustard gas and nerve agents.

This guy has got a history. This is a horrible individual we are dealing with. I am telling you, from the bottom of my heart, this is a cancer on our body. And we have different people telling us, look, do not take it off. Just ignore it; it will go away. I wish we could pray it away, I wish we could hope it away, I wish diplomatically we could negotiate it away. It did not work in 1938 with Hitler, and it is not going to work in 2003 with Saddam Hussein, in my opinion. We tried to make it work. We spared his life through the direction of the United Nations in 1990. We spared Saddam Hussein. We listened to the French; we listened to the United Nations to let his regime exist. Do not destroy his regime; he has learned his lesson. Just like Hitler, negotiate, negotiate. People said let us do anything we can except fight him. We are seeing a repeat of history.

Thank goodness we have a leadership team that understands this and is not

willing to let history repeat itself and is willing to stand up not only for the security of the United States of America but for the security of those countries that are not able, that do not have the capability of our great country and our allies to go in and stop this from occurring. We have the capability today to stop that cancer. We have the chemotherapy treatment. We think we can make this patient do a lot better. And yet members of our own family are trying to convince the patient to walk away from the doctor's office, to deny that the cancer exists, or to admit that it exists and pretend it will go away and to try to negotiate with cancer.

You cannot negotiate with cancer. You must deal with overwhelming superiority if you have got it. And if it is too late, there is not much you can do. Cancer wins the battle a lot of times. It is the same thing here. We have got the tools. We have got the capability. If we do not do it, who will? If the United States of America and its allies do not stand up to this kind of stuff, who will? Do you think the French will ever stand up? Do you think the Germans will ever stand up?

Many countries in the world will not stand up because they do not have the tools. There are a lot of people that would like to join the fight, that would stand up if they had the tools. We have it and we have an inherent obligation to the next generation to do everything we can to stop it while we can.

I am the generation that got it transferred to me. We could have stopped it in 1990. We did not do it. And I will be darned if I am going to stand by and let my generation pass on this problem of mass weapons with this horrible, horrible individual. I will be darned if I am going to stand on the sidelines and pass that to the next generation.

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, I hear some peace people say what weapons, he does not have weapons of mass destruction or he is not a danger to us. I just answered what kind of danger exists.

This is a document of weapons that Iraq has: Mustard gas, 2,850 tons; sarin nerve gas, 795 tons; VX nerve gas, 3.9 tons; tabun nerve agent, 210 tons. This is deadly stuff. Anthrax, 25,000 tons, and we all saw what a few sprinkles of anthrax dust did in the United States Capitol. Take a look at what this will do. Imagine if there were 25,000 tons.

Where did our Nation come up with this list? We did not just create it. This is a list that Saddam Hussein produced for us. This is the list that Iraq admitted they had. Today they said trust me, despite the fact that for 12 years I have broken resolution after resolution, despite the fact that I invaded Kuwait and Iran, despite the fact that I gassed by nerve agents my own citizens, the Kurds, trust me, I do not have these weapons any more.

What did the United Nations do? The United Nations is willing to sit by and say, let us trust him.

Madam Speaker, it is the end of the line. We cannot continue to let this cancer spread.

I do not want Members to think it is a partisan effort up here. It is bipartisan. Let me conclude my remarks with a quote, and I want Members to read this quote with me. "What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him yet more opportunities to develop his program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to press for the release of sanctions and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made. He will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude that he can go right on and continue to build an arsenal of devastating destruction. President Bill Clinton, February 19, 1998."

Madam Speaker, let us not make it a replay of 1938. Let us stand by the President of this country and the bipartisan resolution this Congress authorized. We are a can-do country. Our allies are can-do allies, and we can get this job done.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH C. BEAUPREZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for the remaining 10 minutes.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of this House of Representatives to a special occasion, the 85th birthday of a great American, my father, Joe Beuprez.

Like many other Americans, my dad's greatness does not come from wealth, public acclaim, notoriety, titles, nor worldly deeds. Nonetheless, he has definitely achieved world class status in the roles in life he chose to follow, more inconspicuous, more anonymous than some, but roles of importance requiring great character, substance, faith, and conviction.

Madam Speaker, my dad was content being husband, father and faithful servant to his God. He wanted nothing more than the unqualified love of my mother, the opportunity to work very hard and have something to show for it, to set a path for his children a bit smoother and more pleasant than the one he had to follow and, most importantly, to earn an eternal place in heaven as he believes to be God's plan.

Madam Speaker, like so many of his generation, America's greatest generation, my dad's parents were immigrants. They came to America poor, with little formal education, unfamiliar with our language and our customs. She had been a weaver of fine Belgian lace. He carried her lace in a sack on foot from town to town, selling it in local markets to earn a living. Times were hard, and the First World War threatened. News of opportunity in America offered them hope.

In America my grandfather shoveled coal to furnaces, and later with a loan from a neighbor, sealed with a handshake, he bought 80 acres of land, his own piece of America, something to call his own, and so much more than that sack that he owned in Belgium.

Though he had never been a farmer, with will and determination he learned quickly. In time he expanded the farm, raised eight children, my dad being the sixth, and the one who would end up keeping the farm going as his own, and my home, too, for nearly all my life.

Dad got to eighth grade at the local Catholic school, a 3-mile walk away. The early 1930s were not the best of times, Depression days. To keep the farm going, he came home to help out his dad and older brothers, never getting any more schooling.

My mom was more fortunate, she fished ninth grade before returning full time to her own parents' farm nearby. Mom and dad got married in 1940, and this June will celebrate 63 years together, an enormous and far too unusual achievement in today's world. They raised four kids, they saw to it we all went through that same Catholic school, even though money was always in short supply when we were growing up. They wanted only the best for their kids. All of us got through high school, and off to college, too. They found a way. Used cars, patched overalls, hand-me-down clothes, lots of home-grown cooking, and sack lunches. They found a way.

Many have observed that real heroes are in short supply these days, especially for our young people to emulate. Many of us worry that role models are in far too limited supply. We all certainly learn from our own experiences, learn by doing we call it, but we are also greatly impacted as we grow and develop by those powerful mentors that influence us: Teachers, coaches, neighbors, presidents, pastors and parents.

I will confess, Madam Speaker, that it took far too long for me to realize it, but my dad was the best. I am so blessed to have had him as both dad and hero. By worldly standards, dad might not have had so much. Winston Churchill explained it very well. "We make a living by what we get. We make a life by what we give."

Dad gave so much, and has lived a wonderful, eventful, purposeful life. Allow me to simply reflect on three gifts from my dad for which I am especially grateful: First by his example, he taught me the value of hard work, of self reliance, and personal responsibility. In an age when it seems the norm to try to get along as easily as possible, dad saw differently.

Dad cherished his opportunity to work the soil of that farm and to care for his livestock. Remembering the lessons of the Depression, as well as the drought years of the early 1950s, he knew he could lose whatever he had. He knew he could not do much about the weather nor the markets, the only variable he could control was his effort

and his will, so he pushed himself. By sheer determination, he overcame obstacles to which most men would succumb.

How hard did he work? Well, not only did he farm the soil, he maintained a large cow-calf operation, and in 1952 he started milking some cows, too, to make enough money to pay the bills. He not only tried, he succeeded, and work hard he did. In fact, he never missed a single milking of those cows until he took one day off 14 years later. Even more impressive than his unfailing work ethic was this, he never complained. He never even talked about wanting to take it easier, take a vacation, sleep in just one morning. He had a job to do and a purpose for his work. He showed up every single day, and he did it. Falling to sleep night after night completely exhausted, he would rise well before dawn the next day to do the same all over again.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, as I already mentioned, soon my parents will celebrate their 63rd anniversary. The years and the hard work have taken a toll on them both. Mom broke her hip a couple of weeks ago, and is recovering in a hospital back home. Dad's memory is not quite so crisp any more. Lately he struggles to remember my name. It is a terrible disease, and a tough thing to witness. But he remembers who he loves and is even more devoted and tender to my mom than ever.

In 63 years, and I lived next door to him for most of those years, I never worried once where he spent the night or if he loved my mother. A wise person once said the greatest gift a father can give their children is to love their mother. Well done, dad, I never doubted. Once again, you provided me a perfect role model for my own marriage.

Madam Speaker, my dad gave me a third gift by his profound example. Regardless how deep the snow was, how much hay we had to bale, I knew right where we would be at 8 Sunday morning, in the third pew on the left of that same little Catholic church in which he was baptized. Giving back to God was simply nonnegotiable, because he knew he was blessed and wanted to say thanks.

Faith, family and the value of hard work, he taught me the most valuable lessons of life, and I am eternally grateful.

Madam Speaker, at a time when good examples seem hard to find, leaders often shun the responsibility to be role models. When real heroes are usually found only in history books, I have had the privilege of spending most of my life side by side with one of the all-time best. I think of my dad as a truly great American because he embodies the spirit of America, to try when the odds are against you, to love and have faith unconditionally, to dream big dreams and chase them and sacrifice for them, and to love this land, America, where the spirit inside your soul has the freedom to be as big and endless as this great Nation herself.

Madam Speaker, it is for those reasons I ask to have this tribute entered into the record of the 108th Congress of the United States of America commending the life and contribution of Joseph C. Beauprez of Lafayette, Colorado, on the occasion of his 85th birthday. Happy birthday, dad.

MARTIAL LAW CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight to talk about an issue which I think is of grave concern to this country.

I recently read an article published in the Sydney, Australia, Morning Herald entitled "Foundations Are in Place for Martial Law in the United States."

The author is a man named Ritt Goldstein, an investigative reporter for the Herald, and he said that recent pronouncements from the Bush administration and national security initiatives put in place in the Reagan era could see internment camps and martial law in the United States.

When President Ronald Reagan was considering invading Nicaragua, he issued a series of executive orders which provided FEMA with broad powers in the event of a crisis, such as the violent and widespread internal dissent or national opposition against a U.S. military invasion abroad. They were never used.

But with the looming possibility of a U.S. invasion of Iraq, recent pronouncements by President Bush's domestic security chief, Tom Ridge, and an official with the Civil Rights Commission should fire concerns that these powers could be employed or a de facto drift into their deployment in the future.

□ 2030

On the 20th of July, the Detroit Free Press ran a story entitled "Arabs in U.S. Could Be Held, Official Warns." The story referred to a member of the Civil Rights Commission who foresaw the possibility of internment camps for Arab Americans. FEMA has practiced for such an occasion.

FEMA, whose main role is disaster response, is also responsible for handling U.S. domestic unrest.

From 1982 to 1984, Colonel Oliver North assisted FEMA in drafting its civil defense preparations. Details of those plans emerged during the 1987 Iran-Contra scandal. They included executive orders providing for suspension of the Constitution, the imposition of martial law, internment camps, and the turning over of government to the President and FEMA.

A Miami Herald article on the 5th of July, 1987, reported that the former FEMA director's, Louis Guiffrida's, deputy, John Brinkerhoff, handled the martial law portion of the planning.

The planning was said to be similar to one Mr. Guiffrida had developed earlier to combat a national uprising by black militants. It provided for the detention of at least 21 million American Negroes in assembly centers or relocation camps. Today, Mr. Brinkerhoff is with the highly influential Anser Institute for Homeland Security. Following a request by the Pentagon in January that the U.S. military be allowed the option of deploying troops on American streets, the institute in February published a paper by Mr. Brinkerhoff arguing the legality of this. He alleged that the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, which has long been accepted as prohibiting such deployments, had simply been misunderstood and misapplied. The preface to the article also provided the revelation that the national plan he had worked on under Mr. Guiffrida was approved by Reagan and actions were taken to implement it.

By April, the U.S. military had created a Northern Command to aid homeland security. Reuters reported that the command is mainly expected to play a supporting role to local authorities. However, Mr. Ridge, the Director of Homeland Security, has just advocated a review of U.S. law regarding the use of military for law enforcement duties.

Disturbingly, and it just really should disturb people, the full facts and contents of Mr. Reagan's national plan remain uncertain. This is in part because President Bush took the unusual step of sealing the Reagan Presidential papers last November. However, many of the key figures of the Reagan era are part of the present administration, including John Poindexter, to whom Oliver North later reported.

At the time of the Reagan initiatives, the then-Attorney General, William French Smith, a Republican, wrote to the National Security Adviser, Robert McFarlane: "I believe that the role assigned to the Federal Emergency Management Agency in the revised executive order exceeds its proper function as a coordinating agency for emergency preparedness. This department and others have repeatedly raised serious policy and legal objections to an emergency czar role for FEMA."

Criticism of the Bush administration's response to September 11 echoes Mr. SMITH's warning. On June 7 of last year, the former Presidential counsel, John Dean, spoke of America sliding into a, quote, "constitutional dictatorship," close quote, and martial law.

The reason I raise this issue is that I come from a State where in 1941 under executive order by the President, 9661, we rounded up all the Japanese Americans in this country and put them in concentration camps. We have set in place the mechanism to do that again and we must not, we cannot sacrifice the Constitution in this rush to war that we are doing in Iraq.

DISTURBING EVENTS IN PUERTO RICAN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this body some disturbing events in Puerto Rican politics during recent years. Specifically, I will talk about the corrupt and unethical actions of Puerto Rico's statehood leaders. I would like to start by saying that for many years Puerto Rico enjoyed an impeccable reputation of clean government. I am sad to say that this tradition was tainted by former Governor Pedro Rossello and his administration. During his administration, as Puerto Rico later discovered, there were many corruption schemes and rotten administrators pocketing millions of Federal and local funds. The irony is that the leadership of the Statehood Party, the party led by Governor Rossello for almost 10 years, became the leaders of the first corrupt government in the history of Puerto Rico. A party that claims to admire American democracy, a party that wants Puerto Rico to become a State of the union, was the party that embezzled Federal funds that belonged to our elders, our sick, and our children.

In 1997, the statehooders came to Washington to push for a statehood bill. They used millions of dollars in lobbying and political support to convince Congress that all Puerto Ricans wanted to become a State and used millions to silence the other voices from Puerto Rico. Now we know that this campaign was partially financed by illegal money.

It is amazing that, even today, the leaders of the Statehood Party are unwilling to recognize the depth of the corruption and continue to try to spin the issue as one of political persecution. They have gone as far as accusing the U.S. District Attorney's office in Puerto Rico of promoting prosecutions just for political reasons. They have no remorse.

As a result of the Federal and local investigations of this statehood corruption scheme, during the last months we have witnessed the conviction and indictment of many of the highest-ranking statehood leaders. In this chart, you will be able to see how far corruption went under the Statehood Party's government in the island. This is the Statehood Party's Hall of Shame. The list of corrupt officials and the depth of the corruption are impressive. Here are some of the cases.

In the legislative branch, Speaker Edison Misla-Aldarrondo, Speaker of the House, convicted.

Jose Granados-Navedo, Vice President of the House, resigned under scandal.

Norberto Nieves, legislator, convicted.

Jose Nunez, legislator, indicted.

Anibal Marrero, Vice President of the Senate, resigned under scandal.

Senator Victor Marrero, convicted.

Senator Freddie Valentin, convicted.

Let us see the executive branch: The personal assistant to the Governor, Angie Rivera, the person that had the key to the Governor's office, convicted.

Marcos Morell, secretary-general, executive director of the party, disbarred by the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico because of conflict of interest doing business with the government.

Bernardo Negron, president of the Federation of Statehood Party Mayors, convicted.

Andres Barbeito, director of the Pen-sions Administration, indicted.

Luis Dubon, the owner of the Statehood Party headquarters building, convicted.

Angel Luis Ocasio, deputy chief of staff to the Governor, convicted.

Eduardo Burgos, another deputy chief of staff to the Governor, convicted.

Jose Cobian, deputy finance director of the Statehood Party, indicted.

Victor Fajardo, Secretary of Education, convicted.

Oscar Ramos, administrator of the State Insurance Fund, under special prosecutor investigation.

Daniel Pagan, secretary of the Natural Resources Department, indicted.

Although Mr. Rossello has not been indicted, the extension of these corruption schemes leads to one of two possible explanations: number one, he was part of this scheme; or, number two, he is such an inept administrator that he should not be trusted again with the duty of managing a government or any institution.

When I first arrived as a freshman in Congress 2 years ago, I was informed that millions of dollars in Federal funds had been frozen or were at risk of being frozen because of this situation. The task of Governor Calderon and me was to assure compliance with Federal requirements to make the funds once again available. The projects and programs affected include child care, nutritional assistance, title I, Head Start, TANF, the urban train project, housing and E-rate.

After just 2 years, our efforts brought the desired results: the new administration in Puerto Rico implemented measures to comply with the Federal programs' requirements and the Federal Government of Puerto Rico was able to receive the frozen funds.

I want to clarify that the Statehood Party Hall of Shame has nothing to do with the national parties here. It is a cancer in the statehood movement. For example, Pedro Rossello was a well-known and active Democrat, and Edison Misla-Aldarrondo, the former Speaker of the House, was the Republican Party National Committee man. The common denominator is they belong to the leadership of the Statehood Party.

When the leaders of the Statehood Party come to Washington to lobby be-

hind the backs of the people of Puerto Rico, I urge you to ask them, where were they when their party leaders were using Federal funds for personal and political purposes?

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ANIBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ TO BE ENTERED INTO RECORD

Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this body some disturbing events in Puerto Rican politics during recent years. Specifically, I will talk about the corrupt and unethical actions of Puerto Rico's statehood leaders.

I would like to start by saying that for many years Puerto Rico enjoyed an impeccable reputation of clean government and true public service. Leaders such as Luis Muñoz Marín, Roberto Sánchez, Rafael Hernández Colón, and Luis Ferré, earned the trust and respect of the people for their honesty in the management of the public treasure.

I am sad to say that this tradition was tainted by former Governor Pedro Rosselló and his administration. In 1992 Mr. Rosselló took office with a platform of government reform and ambitious public projects. He governed until the year 2000. During his administration, as Puerto Rico later discovered, there were many corruption schemes and rotten administrators pocketing millions of federal and local funds.

The irony is that the leadership of the Statehood party—the party lead by Governor Rosselló for almost 10 years—became the leaders of the first corrupt government in the history of Puerto Rico. A party that claims to admire American democracy, a party that wants Puerto Rico to become a state of the Union was the party that embezzled federal funds that belonged to our elders, our sick and our children!

In 1997, the statehooders came to Washington to push for a statehood bill. They used millions of dollars in lobbying and in political support to convince Congress that all Puerto Ricans wanted to become a state and used millions to silence the other voices from Puerto Rico. For years many of you in Congress witnessed the costly and aggressive campaign that the Puerto Rico statehood leaders orchestrated to advocate for statehood. Now we know that this campaign was partially financed by illegal money. I wonder how much more of that money was dirty money!

Moreover, Mr. Rosselló disregarded for years pleas by the opposition, by the press, by the civil society in general to investigate his government and his party. Instead of looking into the allegations he decided to conceal the facts, to protect his friend and to defend the corrupt members of his administration. Fortunately the federal authorities did their job in investigating and prosecuting the criminals and the people of Puerto Rico judged the statehood party in the polls.

It is amazing that even today the leaders of the statehood party are unwilling to recognize the depth of the corruption, and continue to try to spin the issue as one of political persecution. They have gone as far as accusing the US District Attorney's Office for the District of Puerto Rico of promoting prosecutions just for political reasons. They have openly said that the Federal Court system and local authorities are part of a conspiracy to criminalize statehood, again showing an utter disregard for the truth. They showed no remorse!

Do not get me wrong, the statehood movement is a legitimate movement and has many

decent and honest members. Unfortunately for them, their leaders have betrayed their cause. There is no conspiracy to criminalize statehood, in fact, most of the convicted officials pleaded guilty in court before their sentences. There is a duty to prosecute the criminals that have hidden behind the statehood banner to steal money and for their own corrupt purposes. It is this leadership that I indict today. This statehood leadership that has inflicted the most damage to the statehood cause in Puerto Rico and the United States.

As a result of the federal and local investigations of this statehood corruption scheme, during the last months we have witnessed the conviction and indictment of many of the highest-ranking statehood leaders, including the personal assistant to former Governor Rosselló, two of the former Governor's Deputy Chief of Staff, the former Speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives and former National Committeeman of the Republican Party in the Island, and the former Secretary of Education that pleaded guilty, to stealing at least \$4.3 million of federal Title I funds for his benefit and the benefit of the Statehood Party.

In this chart you will be able to see how far corruption went under the statehood party's government in the Island. This is the Statehood's Party Hall of Shame. The list of corrupt officials and the depth of the corruption are impressive. Here are some of the cases that have been brought to Justice so far.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. Edison Mislá-Aldarrondo (Speaker, PR House of Rep. And National Committeeman, Republican Party Puerto Rico Committee) Convicted

2. Mr. Aníbal Marrero (Vice President, Puerto Rico Senate) Resigned under scandal.

3. Mr. José Granados-Navedo (Vice President, Puerto Rico House of Reps.) Resigned under scandal.

4. Mr. Norberto Nieves (Member, PR House of Rep.) Convicted.

5. Mr. Freddie Valentín (Senator, PR Senate) Pleaded guilty.

6. Mr. Víctor Marrero (Senator, PR Senate) Convicted.

7. Mr. José Nuñez (Member, PR house of Reps.) Indicted.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

1. Ms. María de los Angeles "Angie" Rivera (Personal and closest assistant of Governor Rosselló) Convicted.

2. Mr. Víctor Fajardo (Secretary, Department of Education) Pleaded guilty.

3. Mr. Daniel Pagán (Secretary, Department of Natural Resources and Environment) Indicted.

4. Mr. Andrés Barbeito (Director, Government Pensions Administration) Convicted.

5. Mr. Eduardo Burgos (Former Deputy Chief of Staff; Director, Municipal Revenues Collection Center) Convicted.

6. Mr. Luis Dubón (Owner, Statehood Party Headquarters' Building) Convicted.

7. Mr. José Cobian (Deputy Finances Director, New Progressive Party) Convicted.

8. Mr. Angel Luis Ocasio-Ramos (Deputy Chief of Staff, Governor Rosselló's Office) Convicted.

9. Marcos Morell (Former Executive Director of the Statehood Party) Disbarred by the Puerto Rico Supreme Court for a conflict of interest doing business with the Rosselló administration.

10. Bernardo Negrón (President, Federation of Statehood Party Mayors) Convicted.

Although Mr. Rosselló has not been indicted, the extension of the corruption leads to one or two possible explanations: 1) he was part of the corruption scheme; or 2) he is such an inept administrator that he should not be trusted again with the duty of managing a government.

During the investigation in cases such as the Secretary of Education scandal, the federal prosecutors found evidence that at least \$1 million from federal funds were funneled into NPP (Statehood Party) coffers. It is widely known in Puerto Rico that the Secretary of Education was a leader in the Statehood Party's GOTV efforts during the political status plebiscite and the general elections.

The widespread corruption that I just described had a negative impact in many federal grants and programs that Puerto Rico was entitled to receive. When I first arrived as a freshman in Congress, I was informed that millions of dollars in federal funds had been frozen or at risk of being frozen because of this situation. The task of Governor Sila M. Calderón and myself was to assure compliance with federal requirements to make the funds once again available. The projects and programs affected include Child Care, the Nutritional Assistance Program, Head Start, TANF, the Urban Train Project, Housing and E Rate.

After just two years our efforts brought the desired results, the new Administration in Puerto Rico implemented the measures to comply with the federal programs' requirements and the Government of Puerto Rico was able to receive the frozen funds.

To do this is difficult to me as a Puerto Rican because the Puerto Ricans are a decent people, hard working people, an honest people. I know that this information may feed some unfair stereotypes. But Congress needs to be cognizant of the truth and I trust that the members of this House will be discerning and will not generalize based on a sad, but isolated case in our history. As a matter of fact, the way this Congress has treated Puerto Rico recently, authorizing the highest increase of federal funds for the Island in the Title I education program and appropriating funds for other important programs is a clear showing that Congress has recognized that Puerto Rico's government is back in good and clean hands. I am here to clear the name of Puerto Rico and to explain how we have extirpated the cancer of corruption.

What are we doing? We are cleaning up house and making sure it never happens again. As a result of the corruption scandals in former Governor Rosselló's administration, Sila M. Calderón ran for Governor of Puerto Rico with the goal of providing the Puerto Rican people with a transparent government. She has dedicated the past two years to implementing tough measures to restore public confidence in government.

I want to clarify that the statehood party hall of shame has nothing to do with the national parties. It is a cancer in the statehood movement. For example, Pedro Rosselló was a well-known and active Democrat; and Edison Mislá, former Speaker of the House was the Republican Party National Committee man in Puerto Rico. The common denominator is that they belong to the leadership of the statehood party.

Although the statehood leadership periodically comes to this capital to express their es-

teem for the U.S., they misunderstand the values that the American flag represents.

When the leaders of the statehood party come again to Washington to lobby behind the backs of the people of Puerto Rico I urge you to ask them where were they when their party leaders were using federal funds for personal and political purposes. Ask them why did they remain in silence? Why they did nothing to fight corruption? Why are they supporting Pedro Rosselló's comeback to Puerto Rican politics, the person responsible for this disaster?

HEALTH CARE CRISIS IN OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, tonight I am very pleased to be here to speak about health care and the crisis that we face here in our Nation and particularly about the crisis that is affecting the Hispanic population and other minority groups.

I am delighted that I have been joined tonight by three colleagues that will speak about some of the situations and problems that they face in their own States. First I would like to, as chairwoman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Health Task Force, recognize the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), who is our representative for the Virgin Islands. She is chair of the Hispanic brain trust for the Black Caucus.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by commending the leadership of the Hispanic Caucus, past and present, my colleague and current Chair, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), and my health counterpart, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), for the leadership they provide for all Americans and for the effective representation they provide to people of Hispanic descent. All people of color face unacceptable barriers to health care, but Hispanics and Latinos face the additional burden of language. Anti-immigrant sentiment places further roadblocks in their way to health services. Because of the leadership of the Hispanic Caucus in collaboration with advocacy groups, attention is being brought to these issues and the barriers are beginning to come down, but there is still much to be done.

Madam Speaker, the racial disparities in health care so ably documented by the Institutes of Medicine report and other reviews continue to show that if you are a minority American, you are likely to receive a diminished quality of care even if you have the same income and educational status. As we recognize the plight of the uninsured this week and the reverberating impact not just on families but on entire communities including those with

insurance, it is important to point out that Hispanics have the highest uninsured rate among all racial or ethnic groups. Studies show that they are at high risk and lack basic access to medical care because of their high uninsured rates. That is why Hispanic Americans are joining other Americans from all backgrounds and parts of this country to rally during this April's Minority Health Month for universal insurance coverage and access to health care. Like other Americans of color and those living in the rural areas of our country, they are at increased risk.

Hispanics are twice as likely as Anglo Americans to have diabetes, twice as likely to have AIDS. Latino children are prone to have asthma, yet less likely to receive care. Too many still use emergency rooms too late in the stages of their illnesses because they lack a regular source of care. We must take steps to turn this around if we are to reach our ultimate goal of wellness for this country.

Further, many of Puerto Rican or Dominican descent comprise a large part of my district in the U.S. Virgin Islands. With their fellow Americans in the U.S. territories, they live under a system that caps Medicaid funding to our hospitals and clinics, leaving a heavy burden of care on municipalities that can afford it least and leaving many residents without access to care. Wherever this or a similar lack of access to care exists, there is also an effect on those with insurance and a direct and adverse impact on the ability of hospitals there to maintain quality health care services for everyone. Uncompensated care affects us all. We must take steps to turn this around if we are to reach our ultimate goals, as I said, for wellness in this country.

And so, Madam Speaker, the minority caucuses of this Congress will host a rally on April 29 on Capitol Hill to bring the attention of our fellow Americans and the Congress to the urgent need for universal access to health care, because this country can no longer afford for so many of its citizens to go without a means to pay for the quality health care that they deserve.

□ 2045

Insured and uninsured alike, we are all in the sinking ship of a failing health care system in this country. The time to become proactive on the health issue that affects Hispanic Americans, African Americans, other minority Americans, rural Americans, and, indeed, all Americans, is now. Access for us, for those of us of color, is access for all.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) for yielding to me. I want to thank my colleagues for inviting me to join them in calling attention to these important issues.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, who in her own right is a leading physician and who has actually done so much to help further the cause for universal health care, access

for everyone and also for HIV and AIDS prevention, and also for those many chronic illnesses that many of us face.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to talk here today on an issue which I think is very timely and very important.

Today I dropped in H.R. 1200, which is a bill that I have dropped in for 12 years, providing universal health care insurance for the entire country. We are all one family. We are not this group or that group or another group or whatever. We are all together in this. We ought to have a plan that covers everybody, no matter where you live, no matter what color your skin is, no matter what ethnic background you come from, what kind of money you have or anything. It should be a system that covers everyone.

Now, today I just took this out of my wallet. I am covered because I have got this piece of plastic in my wallet. If I get in an accident or get sick and they haul me in the emergency room, they will find out I got this piece of plastic and I am covered. I can go for preventive care. I can go for all kinds of things. But if you do not have this piece of plastic, you will have to wait until you are really sick, because you cannot afford to pay for it; and you go into the emergency room, you get health care, but in the most inefficient way possible and the most inhumane way possible, at the end, when you should have been having preventive care before.

Now, this country, for reasons which totally escape me, cannot accept that it is a right for everyone to have health coverage. In Germany, we say, you know, what could the Germans know? In 1883 they put in a universal health care system. If you go to work tomorrow in Germany, you will have insurance tomorrow. They take in Turkish workers, they take in Kurds, they take in Bosnians. All these people come into their country, and they give them health care coverage from the very first day.

The United States has lots of people who come into this country to work. They come here to pick our vegetables, to work in the fields, to do the hard labor in this country. The fact is that of the 42 million people in this country who do not have insurance, 72 percent of them work full-time. They are not lazy. They are pulling their weight. They are doing what you have to do in a society to feed their family. But they do not have health insurance, and it is wrong. I think that the members of the Hispanic Caucus are absolutely correct in bringing this up, that everybody in this country should be covered.

The fact that Hispanics are in fact the least insured in this country is a travesty. If they were not doing the work they do in this country, we could not have the standard of living we have.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks this evening.

Madam Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), the chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk a little bit about health care, and I want to personally first of all thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) for her leadership in the area of health.

On behalf of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is the chairwoman of the Task Force on Health. She has brought to it a great deal of energy. Now she sits on the Committee on Energy and Commerce also, so we have high expectations for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and we want to thank her for what she has done, not only for her constituents back in California, but throughout the Nation, and her efforts in the area of health care. Under her leadership and passion the Health Care Task Force will be at the forefront of issues ranging from chronic diseases to the issues that we are here to discuss tonight, which is the uninsured.

The 2000 census revealed what many of us already knew back home, and that is that the Hispanic community has grown by leaps and bounds over the past decade. Hispanics are now the fastest growing community in the United States and make up close to 13 percent of the U.S. population. So I want to take this opportunity to say that of that part of the population, we have one of the largest numbers of uninsured.

Serving the uninsured must be a top priority for our Nation. Currently we have data to show that 33.2 percent, and it has been growing now with the individuals that have lost their jobs, of Hispanic individuals are uninsured, compared to the non-Hispanic whites who are uninsured at about 10 percent.

Let me tell you, these are people that are hard working individuals, that are out there working and making \$20,000, \$30,000, yet find themselves, if they are working for a small company, they are not going to have access to insurance. Unless they are working for a government, State, local or Federal, unless they are working for a major corporation, they will not have access to insurance.

So it is important for us to look at providing access to that insurance that their children and they need. While 19 percent of all Hispanics depend on Medicare and 35 percent of all Hispanic children depend on what we call the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which is CHIP, for their health care, still many of our needy families are not receiving the services that they deserve.

Despite the rhetoric of the administration, we leave millions of children

behind by President Bush calling for a \$2.1 billion cut in this critical program for children, which is the only health care that a lot of these children receive. These are families that are working, trying to make ends meet. They are not poor enough to qualify for Medicaid, and they find themselves just making too much money, \$20,000, \$30,000, that they do not have access to health care, which is unfortunate.

It is unfortunate for too many working Americans that continue to lack this access to health insurance. Hispanics especially fall into this category. Over 33 percent of the Hispanics are uninsured, as I indicated earlier.

When it comes to health care, despite the promises, the Bush budget leaves our community behind. The Bush budget gives no money to these vital Federal health care programs for Hispanic communities. The Bush budget insufficiently funds the Community Health Centers, which have been out there making a difference, that millions of uninsured low and moderate income individuals rely on for their health care needs. The Community Health Centers have been there in responding to our communities' needs, and we need to make sure they continue to get the resources needed.

The Bush budget also cuts funding to the Office of Minority Health that focuses on health concerns which disproportionately affect minority communities.

The Bush budget also cuts into the future of Hispanic communities by eliminating funding for health career opportunities that aim to increase the number of minority health care providers.

We need to ensure linguistically and culturally appropriate health care by providing minorities an opportunity to go into the health care profession. At the present time we understand and recognize that we have a large number of individuals that could qualify and could enter the profession. A lot of times a little assistance in these programs that allow that opportunity to get into nursing, that allow them to get into some of the other health professions, as well as the medical profession, is important. So every effort needs to be made to continue.

I want to also talk a little bit about diabetes and HIV/AIDS. In diabetes among the Hispanic community, the risk for diabetes is twice that of the non-Hispanic whites. Nearly 11 percent of Hispanics have been diagnosed with diabetes as compared to 7 percent of non-Hispanics.

In the area of AIDS, funding for HIV/AIDS must also address the change in infectious rates. Hispanics have a rate of new infections four times that of non-Hispanics, despite the fact we have made some gains in the area of AIDS. Despite the fact that the number that are getting it and that are suffering serious illnesses are decreasing, the number for Hispanics is growing disproportionately.

So we ask as we look at those issues, such as diabetes that hit Hispanics disproportionately and such as AIDS that now affect those poor communities throughout this country, as well as African Americans, it is time to focus attention to the needs of these populations. I would ask the Bush administration to seriously reconsider their budget when it comes to health.

The Bush administration also has continued to deny legal permanent residents, and I will say that once again legal permanent residents' access to vital programs such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, and the States' Children's Health Insurance Program, such as CHIP. These are individuals that are here legally, these are individuals that have not broken the law, yet we have denied them the right to have access.

One of the proposals that we have serious concerns with this administration on is the proposal that he has taken in hand, and that is that the Medicaid proposal has been one that addresses the needs of the most needy in this country, those that are indigent.

He has taken the Medicaid, and then he has taken the CHIP program, which is the program that addresses the children of the working families of this country, and has taken that program.

Thirdly, he has also gone after the disproportional share, the money that goes to hospitals that provide the indigent care, that provide for those in need.

So those three programs impact the most needy of this country, yet those are the three programs that this administration has chosen to bundle up into one block grant, and his proposal is to send it to the States, with the understanding that as the future goes on there is going to be a cap on it, and in those States where we have disproportional numbers, such as Texas and other States, that we will continue to have a difficulty in that area.

I want to continue to go ahead and address a couple of issues, but I wanted to take this opportunity to thank our task force chairman from the Hispanic Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), on her efforts, and I want to continue to join her here and thank her very much for what she has been doing.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman RODRIGUEZ), our illustrious chair of the Hispanic caucus. I thank him for appointing me as the woman who will be now in charge of the issues regarding Hispanics and health care this term. I am very privileged to be in this position, and I know that we have a long charge ahead of us.

Madam Speaker, tonight, today as Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Health Task Force, I wanted to call attention to the health status of Latinos throughout the United States.

When we talk tonight about Latino health care, it is important to note

that Latinos are the fastest growing minority group in the country, in the United States. So the issues we face confront the health care field throughout the country, whether you live in east Los Angeles, in my district in California, or if you live in Atlanta, Georgia, or in Birmingham, Alabama, where we are seeing a large number of Hispanics now residing in that area. I had the privilege, Madam Speaker, of being there this weekend and walking with other members of our caucus to celebrate a civil rights memorial for 28 years of suffrage that has gone on in the South. The issues are no different there than they are in other parts of the country with respect to those that are uninsured. African Americans and Latinos still face the same kinds of problems.

This week, however, Madam Chairwoman, we are celebrating this week as Cover the Uninsured Week, a national effort that is going on right now, that is being celebrated across the country, to recognize those people who are under-insured and uninsured.

I would be remiss if I did not point to this chart here tonight, to point out that 41 million Americans do not have health care insurance in our country. It is unfortunate that about 30 percent of those individuals are Hispanic.

Let me point that out on this section of the pie chart, 30 percent. Forty-seven percent of non-white/Hispanic, 47 percent. Thirty percent Hispanic, 16 percent black or African American, and 5 percent Asian and South Pacific Islander also fall into that category.

Madam Speaker, by the year 2020, it is projected that one in five children will be Hispanic. Yet Latino children have the highest uninsured rates in the U.S. child population.

□ 2100

And unfortunately, the number of Latino uninsured has been on the rise over the past decade.

I would like to point out the next chart that I have. Here we see also the rising numbers of those individuals that are Latino, that are working, 43 percent; those that are in the private sector, 2 percent; 18 percent Latino, Medicaid; and others that receive some type of coverage; and then those that are in the uninsured category: Latinos, 37 percent, to 14 percent who are Anglo, or white. Madam Speaker, 73 percent of the Anglo population has insurance; 43 percent on this chart here indicates people that are working, working Latino family members are uninsured. It is a crime. It is a crime that this is the situation here in our country.

The next chart unfortunately does not provide us with many more good indicators. The number of Latinos uninsured has been on the rise over the past decade; and all we have to do is start looking at 1990, where 7.0 percent, the number of uninsured Hispanics, has increased 7.0 percent in 1990, a decade ago. When we look to the year 2000, it is now not quite doubled, but almost

there, 11.2 percent. It has increasingly gone up. It is not to say that these people are not working, because they are. I fail to see the reason that they are not being provided with some attempted coverage for those that are uninsured.

In fact, 37 percent of nonelderly Latinos are uninsured, more than double the rate of whites. The large majority of uninsured Latinos come from working families, approximately 87 percent; but less than half of all Latinos have employer-based health coverage. That is to say that where they work, at their place of employment, they do not have any type of insurance coverage for their needs, to meet their needs.

So let us be clear tonight, I say to my colleagues. There are women and men who are working and paying taxes, they play by the rules, but they are not getting any health coverage. This goes far beyond just the Latino community. There are many working men and women, African American, Anglo women that I met, even today when I was out visiting folks in my district, who told me about their plight with not having adequate health coverage, or being underinsured. This is a real issue, I say to my colleagues, that we need to address.

Unfortunately, nearly one-third of all Latinos work for an employer who does not offer any health care insurance at all. The lack of insurance in our country is devastating to families, particularly Latino families. Among the uninsured, Latino adults in fair to poor health, 20 percent are women, 40 percent are men; and they have not visited a doctor in the past year. Can we imagine that, not being able to see a doctor in more than a year?

We know that the uninsured receive less preventive care and are diagnosed later for diseases and tend to receive less medical care for their illnesses. Uninsured children are 70 percent more likely than other children not to have received medical care for common conditions like ear infections, 30 percent are less likely to receive medical attention when they are injured, and nearly 40 percent of uninsured adults report skipping a recommended medical test or treatment in the past year.

Having health insurance would reduce death rates for the uninsured by 10 to 15 percent. How many lives can we save if we provide them with some attempted coverage?

There is a consensus that health insurance is a necessity. So how can we increase access to health insurance? Certainly, we need to make sure that children are enrolled in successful programs like the gentleman from Texas stated earlier, like the State Children's Health Insurance Program, known as SCHIP, and in California known as Healthy Families. And we must make sure that all of our vulnerable populations are enrolled in Medicaid in that safety net program, and that these programs make health care access a reality.

Madam Speaker, we also need to focus on innovative private and public approaches to covering the uninsured. When I was in the State legislature in California, I authored a bill to launch a body of research on how to provide universal health care coverage, and I was proud to be the sponsor of Senate bill 480. The researchers have come up with several proposals for universal health coverage, and many are being implemented now as we speak in Sacramento. Unfortunately, due to severe budget cuts, not only in the State of California but across the board, many of these programs that we have instituted in the past are now on the chopping block. One of the reasons is because of this whole new attempt to try to block-grant Medicaid. Our State is now being devastated with cutbacks in the budget. In California, which is almost a continent in and of itself, we are crying out for assistance now because our budget is woefully low in terms of providing coverage for the very needy, for the working poor, and for children.

Medicaid in California is known as MediCal. It is called MediCal. Our medical program offers dental services, physical therapy, and diabetes management. I was a proud offerer of reforms to provide treatment and management for diabetes. Lord knows the African American community and the Latino community suffer very high rates of diabetes. If it is not treated appropriately in a preventive matter, it can become a very acute problem that will come to haunt us and continues to haunt us if we do not come up with the incentive and money to go into those measures. I say we need to put money up front into programs like that to combat chronic illnesses like obesity, diabetes treatment, and asthma. These are the things that we need to be addressing and putting our money where our mouth is when we talk about providing assistance to the uninsured.

Medicaid is an incredibly important program, and it covers now approximately 40 percent coverage for Latinos; but without this help, I fear what will happen to our communities, not only Latinos, the people that I represent in my district, but poor people, working people, people who actually have jobs that will go without this kind of coverage.

Unfortunately, this administration has proposed what I said earlier, the Medicaid reforms known as block grants. What they are telling us is that they will give States money to be able to get more flexibility to provide coverage for different illnesses; but in the long run, in 10 years, they are going to cut that money back, and what it means is less people will be served. The elderly will be out. The young people, the children will be hurt.

I am here to tell my colleagues that we need to do more than that. We need to reverse that trend and ask this administration to step up to the plate and forget the rhetoric and really talk

about making some very meaningful reforms in Medicaid and providing the coverage that is so very much needed in States like mine in California where we do not get a refund in our dollars. We are known as one of those States where we are a donor State. We give more money than we get back. I am here to say it is time that California and other States in the southwest like Texas, Washington State, and other parts of the country receive their fair share of dollars where we need it. Our seniors are crying out for reform; our children need it. Their voices are not heard often enough, and we know that. That is why we are here tonight, to speak on their behalf as well.

These proposals, as I see them, that the administration is proposing will be devastating; and instead, we should be looking at proposals that increase the Federal support to Medicaid by increasing Federal Medicaid or medical assistance known as FMAP. This bipartisan bill that has been introduced, known as H.R. 1816, will provide States the fiscal relief they need to improve health care access to vulnerable populations. To improve Latinos' access to Medicaid, we must lift the ban on health care access for legal immigrants and pregnant women and their children. I say, and I underscore, legal, people who are here legitimately who are having children here and are playing by the rules and paying taxes as they work, whether they are a nanny, whether they are a housekeeper, whether they are there in a restaurant serving us, or whether they are out in the fields picking our fruits and vegetables that we had here tonight, I say to my colleagues.

It is time to pass the bipartisan Legal Immigrant Child's Health Improvement Act. This bill would lift a 5-year ban currently in place on States receiving Federal support for health care services for lawfully present immigrant children and pregnant women who entered the United States after August 22, 1996.

This simply makes sense from a humanitarian and medical point of view, and it will save the public health system money, thousands and thousands of dollars. I can tell my colleagues that firsthand as a Representative in Los Angeles County where we have one of the largest health care, public health hospitals right now that sees so many individuals having to wait 8 hours just to be seen by one doctor, whether it is for a throat infection, an ear infection, or for being a victim of a drive-by shooting. It is unheard of, the kind of medical access that people have to attempt to receive, knowing fully that we are all paying for this standard of health care. Yet, it is unequal in areas that I represent. We have to change that. We have to work hard to make sure that it is equal for everybody, whether one lives in Texas, in the Rio Grande, whether one lives in Boston, Massachusetts, or whether one lives here in Washington, D.C.

We also must fix Medicare in order to help Latino seniors who are struggling with high-cost prescription drugs. This goes far beyond the Latino community. There are many, many seniors who are crying out for reform, who want to see their prescription drugs, the cost for that medication reduced dramatically. I can tell my colleagues now there are people who have told me, why is it that I have to pay \$300 for my medication to treat my diabetes or my thyroid gland? I cannot afford to go on vacations; I barely make my rent. Why is it that the Congress cannot come together and make these reforms feasible so that I can live an appropriate life, one that I feel I deserve? This is what seniors are telling me all the time. I look at them and I look in their eyes and I feel we have done them a disservice, because we have not been able to reach an agreement with the other Members on the other side of the aisle to see that we are truly, truly addressing the needs of our senior population.

I say that fully knowing that my own parents are faced with that dilemma right now. They have one of those plastic cards that allows them to go see their HMO, Kaiser, Kaiser coverage; but they have to pay a copayment. If they have surgery, they have to pay another copayment. If they have to go in to get treatment for their thyroid, they have to pay another \$200 or \$300 every month, and my parents are on a fixed income. They no longer work. They are over 70 years old. I know there are millions of seniors that are in that same predicament, and they probably even have harsher, harsher illnesses than my own parents. And I pray that they will be able to make it as they see their daughter here try to get a resolution to provide an adequate prescription drug benefit for them, that is low cost, that does not discriminate against them, whether they are in an HMO program or if they are seeing their own fee-for-service doctor. There should be no discriminate treatment for either, and that is what I am going to work hard for, and I know that our Hispanic Caucus will do the same.

I want to tell my colleagues that recently I have had a chance to visit with a lot of my seniors in my own district in Monterey Park and in my new cities that I represent in Covina and West Covina, which were previously represented by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). I want to tell my colleagues that folks are telling me the same thing: we have to change. We have to change the rules of the game so that everyone receives a fair, level playing field when it comes to access to health care.

Right now, because unemployment rates are so high, people are losing their jobs, they are losing their health care coverage. Today I saw a woman who I spoke to who runs her own business out of her own house. She told me that one of the opportunities that she had was to try to provide her own coverage for health care. It would cost her

a minimum of \$500 a month. That was entirely too much for her. What does that mean for her? That means that she is going to have to forego that. If she gets ill, God forbid. If she has to go to the doctor, God forbid. If she gets really sick or hit by a car or she becomes tremendously ill, she will have to go to a public emergency or trauma center, which is going to cost the public dollars, the taxpayers a lot more money. If we were just to put more money in to help the uninsured, we could save a whole lot in the long run.

I am advocating for us to have that discussion here tonight, for us to talk about other options for providing assistance to the uninsured and the underinsured, because there are a whole lot of people out there who are working that make \$15,000, \$16,000 a year, they have four kids, they are beating themselves up because they want the best for their kids; but they cannot afford to even make a copayment to have adequate coverage. It is time that we start looking at providing assistance to the uninsured, because every tax dollar that they pay into when they see their check, their payroll check, it says a deduction, but where does that deduction go? Is it going into a health care trust fund for them? Is it going to be available for them when they need it? Is it going to be available for their children? Those are the questions that I ask here tonight.

I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), the chairman of the Hispanic Caucus, to please share with me what insights he might be able to shed on this issue.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman for allowing us to be here tonight, and I want to thank her for her leadership in the area of health. Also, as I was looking at the data that she had before us and the research and all of the studies, one of the things that was glaring was the fact that things are not getting any better; they are getting worse. As they get worse, we come up here and we get elected to respond to the problems that we are confronted with, we get elected to hopefully come up with some solutions to those problems. But it is unfortunate that some people are up here not to solve problems, but to see how they can leverage their political power in the process of not responding to the needs of our constituency in this country.

So one of the things that is important, as the gentlewoman indicated, is, and the research shows, that of the ones that are uninsured, 87 percent, especially the Hispanics, 87 percent of them are hard-working Americans. These are people that are not out there not working and being lazy; these are people that are making \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 a year. Yet, if they work for a small company, they do not have access to insurance. Once again, unless they are working for the Federal Government or the State government or

some form of government, they do not have access to insurance, or a major corporation.

□ 2115

And so these are hard working Americans that are trying to make ends meet. They make some money and because of that they do not qualify for the Medicaid for the indigent. And now we are trying to take away the only thing that they might qualify for, which is to ensure their children an access to health care. So in this country we would hope that as we move forward, we make every effort to make it affordable and accessible. What good is it that we have the best health care in the whole world, the best research, if it is not accessible and it is not affordable? It does not make any sense. So hopefully we will continue to work on that.

I just wanted to also add that, additionally, we have only 43 percent that have employer based coverage compared to 73 percent for Anglos, which means that most Hispanics are working for even smaller companies and so they do not have any access.

I wanted to share with the Congresswoman, I represent Starr County on the Mexican border. I have 11 counties. Starr County is a beautiful county, yet it has the distinction of being one of the poorest in the 2000 Census. It is the poorest in the entire Nation. In Starr County we have close to 40 percent of those between the ages of 19 to 64 are without health insurance, 40 percent of the population. And the lack of insurance means restricted access to preventative care which can lead to costly emergency room visits, poor quality of life and even shortened lifespan. While we have a patchwork of Federal and State types of programs, we continue to have difficulty. And I know that there is a talk about the private sector coming in. Well, I represent rural America, too. I have 11 counties. I have a lot of what we call the "brush country" in Texas in San Saba, in Frio, La Salle, in Atascosa, Duval, Jim Wells also, those counties out there as well as Starr and now parts of Hidalgo, those counties are rural counties, a lot of them are rural counties and the ones that are rural counties have difficulty getting the private sector to come in. So despite the fact that we have had the private sector move into Medicare, they have not had the experience.

I will share with you what happened to one of my counties that I used to represent that I do not now, in Wilson County, where the private sector was not making the profits that they wanted to see. They cannot get rid of the individuals if they are not making the profits, but what they can do is decide not to service the entire county. So they decided to get rid of most of the rural counties.

So in rural America we are having a rough time. And if you work in rural America and live in rural America, most likely you are working for a

small company. You are working for a small employer who does not have access to health insurance. That is why it is important for us to provide that alternative. That is why it is important for us to provide that access to health care that is so critical.

I wanted to also share with the gentlewoman that it is unfortunate that there are no easy answers, but the reality is that we can come up with if the will was there, we could make something happen. But it is unfortunate that we have not come to grips with it and we are not close to answering the problems. But the election is coming up in 2 years, and people have talked about meeting the prescription drugs. I saw the ads lots of time calling to thank Congressman so-and-so for their legislation that they had passed. Well, I want to ask where are they now on that piece of legislation? Nowhere.

And the same thing with the proposal on prescription drug coverage that this administration has put forward. It is embarrassing. It is a sham. The Bush administration in terms of their proposal on drug prescription, I am sick and tired of these types of responses when people are sincere. When they come to me when I go to churches they tell me, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, I cannot afford to buy the prescription. I cannot afford it. I buy my husband's. I cannot buy mine. We go without food because we are on fixed incomes.

We have got to do something about this. Once again, it does not make any sense for us to have all the remedies in the world when our own constituency who are working hard and trying to make ends meet do not have access to this.

I wanted to take this opportunity if it is okay to talk a little bit about the Hispanic Health Improvement Act that the gentlewoman is a co-author of that piece of legislation. I would like to use a little time on that.

This week we will be introducing the Hispanic Health Improvement Act with Senator BINGAMAN and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and members of the Hispanic Congressional Caucus. This will be landmark legislation and it is based on the previous Hispanic Health Act. I reintroduced it in the 106th Congress with existing legislation with Senator BINGAMAN, who has been a champion for us. And I want to personally thank him for his efforts in the area of health care because he has been there.

In addition, we have taken some of the Federal regulations from the Hispanic Health Leadership Summit, as the gentlewoman will recall. We convened last August. The Hispanic Caucus convened in a group and incorporated many of the suggestions of the group. And we invited two Members from each side of the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, we invited them to San Antonio to come and talk about the needs of Hispanic health. We had a good representation from both Republicans and Democrats come for-

ward and participate in our conference. And the legislation offers a variety of different strategies for expanding health care coverage, improving access, and that is important.

If you have the decisions that respond to the problems that we are encountering but you do not provide the access, it does not do any good. And also we talk about affordability. It has got to be affordable, otherwise forget it. I do not care how good the response is. If the person does not have any money, it is not accessible. It is not affordable. They will not be able to live unless they get that accomplished.

And then we also reduced and addressed the health disparities. We know that in certain communities such as the Hispanic communities and the African-American community that we have disparities such as diabetes, AIDS and varieties of others. So while we consider each provision in our bill, we look to improve it. And I am just going to highlight just a few things from the piece of legislation.

In order to address the lack of health care coverage, the legislation provides \$33 billion between fiscal year 2003 and 2010 for the expansion of the successful State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, and to cover the uninsured, low-income pregnant women and parents. So we are looking at those working parents and women that are expecting. In addition, it provides States the option to enroll legal immigrants. Once again, we are not talking about undocumented illegals. We are talking about legal residents, legal immigrants, pregnant women and children, access to both Medicare and SCHIP.

In addition, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus considers the expansion of Medicaid and CHIP eligible to be critical legislative priorities for improving health, Hispanic health. The bill also seeks to address Hispanic health disparities and requires an annual report to Congress on Federal programs or responding to improving health status of Hispanic individuals with respect to both diabetes, cancer, as the gentlewoman has mentioned, asthma, HIV infection, AIDS, substance abuse and mental health. And the legislation provides \$100 million for targeted diabetes prevention as well as education, school-based programs, and screening activities in the Hispanic communities. Similarly, the bill provides for targeted funds for programs that were aimed at preventing suicide.

One of the things that we have noticed recently, and when I have first heard about the issue of suicide among young Hispanic young ladies, I was not aware of the seriousness of the situation and how bad it was, and so the issue of mental health in responding to the needs of young Latinos who are committing suicide. We really need to be conscious of that. This country has really not come forward when it comes to the mentally ill, whether Hispanic or non-Hispanic. The mentally ill real-

ly are not addressed and especially our young, the youths, when it comes to mental illness, we need to see what we can do for them much sooner for them and see how to address these needs. We are hoping to begin to address the issue of mental illness.

And I want to lastly indicate that we seek in the bill to reduce health care disparities also by addressing the lack of providers who can provide culturally competent and linguistically appropriate care. That is so important. When you look at especially therapists that provide access to psychiatrists to Hispanics who when the doctor is unable to speak the language of the client, you know that the type of care is not going to be up to where it should be. When in describing the type of medication that is needed, having an understanding of the client in terms of culture is also extremely important; and we can cite some examples later on. But the bill also provides for increased funding for HRSA, health professions and the diversity programs.

As you know, the President's budget for 2003 budget proposal eliminates virtually all funding for these types of programs. So you tell me that we are needing people in the area of health care in every forum, we need minority representation in those areas, and yet these programs that are so needed by our community are the same programs that this administration is choosing to cut.

In addition to the promoting of diversity, these programs support the training of health professionals in the fields experiencing shortages, such as pharmacy, dentistry and allied health. They promote access to health care services in the medically underserved communities.

I want to also mention that the Hispanic Caucus considers increased funding for those programs a high priority. As the Hispanic community continues to grow, the implementation of these provisions will take on even greater importance, so the consequences of inaction will be felt for many years. So we encourage both the Democrats and the Republicans and the administration to reconsider their budget when it comes to health because their budget is one that basically says we do not care. We are not here to respond to the problems that are confronted by their little proposal. The President's proposal is a sham and I know that people, even Republicans that look at it, ought to be ashamed of that and they are embarrassed because it really does not address the issues that confront our communities and address the issues of our constituency when they come and say, how can I have access to buy the prescription that I need for my husband or my wife? And the answer is that unless we come together on that and unless we address that need, the bill that is before us does not answer the problem, and the solution that is there is only a political solution that really does not address the problem that is out there.

But the constituency back home will have an opportunity because the election will be coming up in 2 years. And I am hoping that as we go forward that we will make some inroads. And we have an opportunity because I know that both Democrats and Republicans are looking to get votes from the Hispanics. Well, you have a good opportunity. You start addressing the problems that confront our community, and I think our community will be willing to respond, I think, if that is the case. But if you give us lip service such as we are getting from this administration, then the results will be that you are not going to get our support and it is not going to happen because you are not there sincerely trying to address our problems.

I know this is the gentlewoman's time. I want to thank the gentlewoman very much for taking the time to be out here tonight.

Ms. SOLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ). It is a pleasure to be here tonight with him and other Members that came forward to speak on this very important issue.

The gentleman touched on so many important areas that we do not even have time in our committees, and as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, a new member, we did not even have sufficient time to debate this new proposal that the administration is putting forward.

We had about 3 weeks ago Secretary Tommy Thompson come forward and talk about the aspect of trying to block grant Medicaid, and I talked about that earlier. What it means, block granting, is that we are ratcheting down health care. Fewer people get fewer health care. Not more care, fewer. And with the rising increase of population with the uninsured, it means less dollars, not only for Hispanics but for blacks, for Asian Americans, even for Anglos that right now are uninsured.

□ 2130

We have to do something. We have to take action.

Rural America also has been neglected in this debate. We are not doing nearly enough to provide incentives for health care centers, public health care centers to be adequately funded, serving our at-risk populations out there and I mean in particular women and men over the age of 40 who are still toiling out there, whether they are working in the fields or working in rural America who have no benefit of health care access.

We need to put funding there. We have to come up with formulas that are expanding and broadening support of the Federal Government to reach out to these rural communities.

My colleague hit an important note that I want to touch on also, and that is, with respect to the shortage of health care professionals that exist, the opportunities for people to get into the medical profession and especially

in the nursing profession. Many of our community colleges at this point in time do not find that they have adequate funding to offer the curriculum that costs a lot of money, but money that is invested and well-spent can provide a product that will mean so much for our society, and I am asking this administration to put more money into those areas, into those health career professions and create those career ladders and opportunities not only for Latinos who want to come back and serve in their community but for all underrepresented groups and particularly those people who live in rural America.

I also want to touch on the aspect of mental health because in that whole discussion we forget about women and individuals who are afflicted by domestic violence, people that have the right under welfare reform, TANF legislation that provides them the ability to get help. Many of these individuals are being asked now to get off of welfare as we know it and to find jobs, but their illnesses have not been addressed. Some have mental illness. Some have substance abuse. Many are victims, at least 50 percent of the caseload can report that they have been victims of domestic violence.

Why have we not done a better job of monitoring those individuals? They are going to go back into that cycle and there will be no remedy for them. We should put dollars up front for prevention in mental health care and that should be covered by any health insurance program, and that is not being adequately addressed.

I know that the former Senator Paul Wellstone had a proposal that is being reintroduced under his name to try to provide that incentive for fully covering mental health care illnesses so that when we detect them we can get to those individuals that need that help to remedy and provide them from creating more harm to themselves, and I know that our caucus will be working hard to promote that.

Lastly, I would just like to say that we have a long way to go in terms of health care. We talk about education as being a privilege and a right for everyone in America, but I do not think that we have talked enough about providing equal access to health care for Americans and people who reside in this country. Our country is so wealthy, we are one of the wealthiest countries in the world, and yet we forego providing assistance and immunization for children to combat TB, to fight HIV, infections that are now ongoing in communities like mine and like my colleague's.

I ask this administration why, why is it that we could send billions of dollars across this country to fight a war and not use that same money to fight the wars that are here on our own Earth, on our own country to combat AIDS, to combat diseases, chronic illnesses in here and making an investment in the very families that are sending their

young men and women abroad to fight a war.

It is nonsense that we forego the kinds of opportunities that we have here at home to put that money where it will be well spent, that will reap profits and benefits for this country tenfold, in 10 years to come, instead of bankrupting our system right now.

Those are the questions that I have. Those are the questions that my constituents have been asking me, and I hope that this administration will step up to the plate and begin to outline their plan to provide a recovery for health care for all Americans but particularly in this case tonight for the uninsured and for the Latino community.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman once again and touch a little bit on a couple of things that she mentioned.

On the mentally ill, there is no doubt that is one of the areas that we have not made the inroads that we should have. In this country, in a way, we have been negligent, not being responsive to our youth when it comes to the mentally ill. We have not provided the resources that are needed. We forgot all about Columbine and how that occurred, the fact that we really need to go and see what is happening. Youngsters, a lot of them were suffering from depression. We need to make sure we pay a little more attention to what is occurring in those areas and spend some time and look at the number of suicides of young people that is occurring.

So I am hoping that we begin to address some of these issues, and I am hoping that the will will be there to make something happen.

The gentlewoman also mentioned, I know, the issue of rural America. Rural America right now, and I represent 11 counties that I indicated already that are having a rough time getting access, and one of the reasons why we decided to privatize part of Medicare is because the whole argument was to try to reduce the costs. In fact, the other side argued that Medicare is a government-run program and this and that, that they could do it better. We have tried that experiment, and as my colleague well knows, that experiment has failed. In fact, right now, if a person is under Medicare+, they are costing the Federal Government more money than a straight Medicare, despite the fact they might be paying \$300 additional money.

So it is a gimmick to try to destroy the program. We know and people understood that if they provide access to our seniors, they are the ones that they are less likely to make a profit on because they are ill. The data that shows that a person on the average spends over \$1,000 on prescription drug coverage when they are seniors. There is no insurance company that is going to be able to make the profits they would like to see from our most vulnerable in this country and our seniors, and we

should not be doing that. We need to see how we can make it affordable.

What angers me, and I know what angers Americans, is that that same pharmaceutical company that sells those products that contributes to the politicians up here and contributes big bucks and puts those ads to thank those Congressmen for nothing basically because they did not accomplish a darn thing except the elections were coming up, those are the same companies that choose to sell those medicines in Canada and elsewhere for half the price, for one-third of the price.

The sincerity of their efforts, it is a crime what they are committing, and it is sad that we have got to this point that those same products can be bought in Mexico and Canada for much less, and it is the same company, and it is unfortunate that the ones that are having to pay because they claim that they are doing that for research purposes, and yet who are they sticking it to? Our most vulnerable, our seniors, who buy a large percentage of the prescriptions.

So I am hoping that we can come up with a realistic plan, and the people in this country, they are not stupid. They are going to see right through the President's proposal on prescription drugs. It helps a few at the expense of everyone else, because most people, at least the constituency of the Hispanic community, the only thing they have is Social Security. They do not have any other pension, and if they do, it is a small one. They do not have additional money to dish out \$300 or more for additional coverage, and even though they get additional coverage, the private sector is not interested because if they do get sick they do not make a profit.

We have all understood that, and that is why we need to come up to the plate. This is no way to treat our seniors after they have given of themselves. This is a time for us to reach out to them and provide whatever assistance that we can and to be able to make it also in a way that is accessible and affordable.

So I wanted to once again thank my colleague for what she has done, and I want to also share that in health care somehow we have not come to grips because we do have a lot of Congressmen out here that basically feel that the Federal Government should have no role in health care, and apparently they feel that way and they feel that it should be just privatized. But we understand that people get ill and cost insurance companies, and we know that the insurance companies, as soon as a person gets a serious illness, will dump them if they have the opportunity, despite the laws that we have tried to pass.

That was happening in the 1960s, when we established Medicare and Medicaid, and that is happening now, so the companies are there, and for good reason, they are there to make a profit and provide access to health care

but they are there to make a profit. So a person does not have any problems while they are young and healthy, but as soon as they get ill and they need them, that is when they start having the difficulties. Anyone who has gotten ill understands that and recognizes that.

So their main priority is to be there to make a profit and secondary is everything else, and that is why the Federal Government has a role and a responsibility. The health of this country depends on the quality of life for our constituency.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being here this evening and sharing his thoughts and words.

Again, I just want to underscore why we are celebrating here tonight, to talk about the real issue, and the real issue is that there is so many millions of Americans that are uninsured, 40 million, and we need to change that, and we need to do more here in the Congress and work together on both sides of the aisle to see that we come up with some remedies that can be taken care of this legislative session.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ). I want to thank also other speakers that came here tonight representing the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), and also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT). I am very privileged.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE FORGOTTEN DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to talk about two very serious issues for this Congress, for this President, certainly its effect on future generations and current and future retirees.

First, I am going to talk about defense spending, the overzealousness of Washington to continue to increase spending two, three and four times the rate of inflation, and what that means is increasing debt that we are going to leave to our children.

So what I have titled the first part is "The Forgotten Deficit," and though, right now overshadowed maybe by national security and the conflict in Iraq, this year's budget is very important. We must reverse the rapid descent into deficit spending that we have seen in the recent years.

Let me give my colleagues an example. From the \$236 billion surplus that we had in the year 2000, the budget situation has deteriorated to a projected \$436 billion deficit. From a \$236 billion surplus 3 years ago now we are looking at \$436 billion Federal funds deficit for this fiscal year and the same for next year. This is a swing of more than \$600 billion in a \$2.1 trillion budget, and this deficit is going to be much larger because this deficit from CBO does not include any money for the defense supplemental that is coming. It does not include any money for the extra cost of whatever we might do in Iraq, and it certainly does not include the effects of any tax cuts.

It should greatly concern us all that government spending is growing explosively as revenues decline. Discretionary spending has been at least 6 percent each year. The increase in discretionary spending has been at least 6 percent each year since 1995 at about 7.5 percent each year since 1998.

The chart I have on my left shows the projected increases on out after 2003, starting in 1993. So fairly flat from 1993 to 1997 and then a dramatic growth in spending, and we are looking at a situation where the discretionary spending growth will average at least 7.5 percent each year since budget balance was reached in 1998, about this level.

This spending increase, compared to what families are doing, how they are dealing with their possible increases in their budgets, is too dramatic to sustain, and it is leaving us huge challenges and huge problems for the future.

The President proposed a budget increase for 2004 of 3.5 percent, but even so, even though this is a smaller increase than we have seen over the past years, is still an increase in Federal Government spending, about twice the rate of inflation. This includes some needed spending on defense after September 11, I admit that, but we cannot excuse unrestrained nondefense spending which should not be increased during the challenge in the war situation that we are now in on terrorism.

□ 2145

Tomorrow, our House Committee on the Budget is going to mark up a budget resolution. I just stress, as strongly as I can, that it is important to the future of our economy and to the future of this country to start having the intestinal fortitude to hold down spending, to prioritize some of the spending we do. Some of the spending we do is much less necessary. Probably much of it is unnecessary.

As we ask the American people to do with less, as States all over the country are cutting back their budgets and suggesting that people are going to have to do more for themselves during these tight times, the Federal Government goes merrily along spending, and I will not give any comparisons to sailors or anybody else because I think we

exceed almost anybody else's level of increased spending.

Government, at the Federal level, does not have the constraints of most States that have constitutional language that says that they cannot spend more than what is coming in to their government. In Washington, we can simply increase the deficit. And that is what we are doing. We are going to be increasing the deficit with this budget, after we pass this budget. Because of supplementals coming in, we are going to increase the Federal limit on the Federal debt. Every time we increase the Federal debt, Congress has to pass a law saying we are going to increase the Federal debt, and the President has to sign that law. And that is what we are doing.

In fact, we have tried to make it easier for ourselves by saying when we pass a budget that spends more money than the existing Federal debt, automatically we are going to consider a bill passed that increases the Federal debt to the level needed to accommodate that particular budget. I think this is a mistake for a couple of reasons, but one is that it makes it too easy to not face up to what we are doing with the increase in debt for this country and the challenge that that puts on future generations. I mean, what we are doing, in effect, is suggesting that our problems today are so great that it deserves us taking the money from the earnings of our kids and our grandkids to pay for today's spending. It is sort of pretending that they are not going to have their own problems 20 and 30 years from now.

The debt problem is soon to come to the fore as Congress is forced to increase the debt limit. The debt limit today is about \$6.4 trillion, and we are going to dramatically increase that because we are dramatically increasing spending. If we cannot have an average of zero increase in nondefense discretionary spending, we should not have a tax cut. The enormity of Federal spending is almost inconceivable. Even as States and families cut their budgets, the Federal Government is squandering tax dollars faster than ever before.

The \$2.1 trillion proposed budget is more than the Federal Government spent in the 178 years between 1789 and 1966. Let me say that again. The budget that is being proposed for this next year, that we are working on and the budget resolution is going to accommodate in markup tomorrow in the Committee on the Budget, is more than government has spent in the 178 years between 1789 and 1966. It amounts to over \$7,500 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is neither fair nor realistic to assume that our problems today are so great that we should be putting this burden on our kids and our grandkids and future generations. Debt and deficit spending is an obligation to increase taxes sometime in the future.

Let me move to the problem of Social Security, which is a huge financial

problem for this country. Social Security is one of the best retirement programs that we have. And as many of the people in America, Mr. Speaker, have heard, Social Security is facing a very dire financial situation, and that is because we have a coming Social Security crisis. Our pay-as-you-go retirement system will not meet the challenge of demographic change.

This chart represents the number of workers that are working. And what happens in this pay-as-you-go system that we started in 1934 with Social Security, current workers pay in their FICA tax, their Social Security tax, and immediately that money is not saved in some account for workers today, but it is immediately spent on paying the benefits of current retirees.

So when I talk about demographic change, I am talking about a situation where 26 people in 1940 were working and paying in their tax for each retiree. By 2000, it got down to three workers; three workers now paying a much-increased percentage of what they earn to accommodate the retirement of every one retiree. By 2025, we are looking at people living longer, a decline in the birthrate, so there will only be two people working and paying in their taxes to cover the benefits of every one retiree. A huge burden. A huge challenge.

As we borrow all this extra Social Security money that is coming in now, and that is going to run out very rapidly, currently we are looking at \$199 billion more coming in every year, if you include the interest that is coming into Social Security over and above what is required to pay out, by 2016 we are looking at a situation where there is no longer going to be enough tax revenues coming in by current workers to pay for the benefits of current retirees.

Look at this next chart with me. Insolvency is certain. We know how many people there are, and we know when they are going to retire. We know that people will live longer in retirement. We know how much they will pay in and how much they are going to take out in benefits, and payroll taxes will not cover benefits starting in 2015 or 2016; and the shortfalls will add up to \$120 trillion between 2015 and 2075. Now, compare those huge numbers of trillions with our current budget that we are spending in 1 year. So the next-year budget that we are looking at is \$2.1 trillion. But over this time period, we are looking at some way that we are going to have to increase borrowing or increase taxes or cut benefits to accommodate that unfunded liability of \$120 trillion.

The biggest risk is doing nothing at all, and that is what we have been doing. I first came to Congress in 1993; but actually, I wrote my first Social Security bill when I was chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance in the State of Michigan, because it was one of those areas that looked like the greatest challenge for the Federal Government, how we were going to accom-

modate the situation where the number of workers is decreasing in relation to the number of retirees. And in a pay-as-you-go system, it just does not work out. It just is going to mean that Social Security is going bankrupt unless we make some changes.

The longer we put off the solution, the longer that it is demagogued in elections, the longer that Members of Congress and the President and the Members of the Senate are unwilling to sit down and talk about solutions, the more drastic those solutions are going to have to be. And that is because we have a temporary surplus coming into Social Security now, after the huge tax increase of 1983. The tax increase was so great that we have temporarily ended up with more money coming in.

Every dollar that has been coming in, government takes and spends and writes the Social Security trust fund an IOU. So the question is: Where is government going to come up with this extra money in 2016 or 2017 when funds coming in from the FICA tax, from the payroll tax no longer are large enough to pay the promised benefits? And to keep paying promised Social Security benefits, the payroll tax will have to be increased by nearly 50 percent, or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent.

It is unfair. It is unreasonable. It is unconscionable not to face up to this problem and to move ahead with this problem. And of course in most of my elections, because I have introduced the Social Security reform bill that has been scored to keep Social Security solvent every session since I have been in Congress since 1993, my opponents have demagogued this. They have said, look, NICK SMITH is trying to ruin Social Security and, therefore, do not elect him. But I think more and more Americans, Mr. Speaker, are now starting to face up and realize that Social Security is becoming insolvent; and if we do not deal with it, the problem is going to be much worse.

Let me just give a little bit of history on what has happened since we started Social Security in 1934. Every time there was a problem of the money coming in on taxes being less than what was needed to pay benefits, taxes were increased and/or benefits were reduced. Let us not let that happen this time. Let us face up to the problem. Let us deal with it. Let us have both sides work together, without demagoguery, with not playing politics and trying to criticize either side. And both sides have been at fault in some of these situations.

Social Security has a total unfunded liability of over \$9 trillion today. If you take that \$9 trillion that we need today and spread it out over the time period of 2015 to 2075, then it means \$120 trillion in those future inflated dollars that we are going to have to come up with sometime through that time period to pay benefits. The Social Security trust fund contains nothing but IOUs. So in 2016, 2017 how are we going

to come up with the money? Do we increase the income tax? Do we increase the payroll tax?

Already 75 percent of American workers in this country pay more in the payroll tax than they do in the income tax. So I say, no, we cannot increase the payroll tax. Will Members of Congress be brave enough to say, look, we are going to have to cut back on some of this other spending? I certainly hope they will. Our increase in spending at two and three and four times the rate of inflation has maybe been politically wise in a reelection sense, because as you come up with new programs and make more promises to people and say we are going to take care of more of the problems with the Federal Government, that means the Federal Government gets bigger. But since it is unpopular to increase taxes, what we have done is increase borrowing. And again, increased borrowing is nothing more than a promise that taxes are going to have to go up sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one last comment as I conclude tonight's colloquy on some of the problems that we are facing, and that is that we are dealing with Social Security and spending and it has been politically wise for politicians to put off coming up with a solution on spending. So the tendency of Congress is we wait until it is almost a crisis before we deal with that crisis.

In terms of coming up with new programs, Members of Congress have found that it is easier to get elected because they go on television cutting the ribbon and on the front pages of their newspapers when they come up with new programs to help people in solving some problem. Look, there are lots of problems across the United States. We have a system of government in the United States that has served us very well, but government cannot solve all those problems, and government should not solve problems that States and individuals can solve for themselves.

We have a system not because we are stronger than people in other countries, not because we are smarter, but because our system encourages hard work; it encourages productivity. So we have said in our constitution those individuals that study and use that knowledge, those that work and save and invest end up better off than those that do not.

□ 2200

That is a system that other countries around the world are now trying to copy. Let us get back to that system. Let us hold the line on spending, and let us stand up and deal with the Social Security problem.

AMERICA GOING TO WAR AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to take some time to address one of the most serious questions facing our Nation today, whether we go to war against Iraq in the next few weeks.

The tragic attacks upon our country on September 11, 2001, transformed our thinking about national security in this country. In the wake of September 11, the Bush administration rightly sought to define the fundamental mission of American power around the goal of fighting international terrorism. After September 11, the international community rallied behind America's war on terrorism with unprecedented unity and diplomatic, military, intelligence and other support. For the first time in its history, NATO invoked Article V of the Washington Treaty declaring the September 11 attack to be an attack on all 19 NATO member countries. Within 24 hours of its introduction by the United States, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution unanimously calling on all member countries to support the war on terror.

The subsequent U.S.-led military action against the Taliban forces in Afghanistan and the reconstruction efforts that followed received broad support from the international community.

Now less than 18 months later, the situation has changed dramatically. Polls show that anti-American sentiment is rising around the world, and some 70 percent of the world's citizens believe that the United States presents the greatest threat to world peace today, ahead of Iraq and North Korea.

U.S. relations with many of our traditional allies in the North Atlantic Alliance are more strained than at any point in that organization's history. Moderates in the Muslim world feel isolated and have begun to question their relationship with the United States. Our credibility has been damaged, and our moral authority eroded. Many serious threats to our security are not receiving the attention they deserve.

How did we get to this state of affairs just 18 months after the world community united behind U.S. leadership in the war on terrorism? How did we so quickly squander the reservoir of goodwill that we had immediately after September 11?

The answer lies squarely with the Bush administration's defense and foreign policies and the arrogance with which they have conducted those policies. Following the successful military campaign against the Taliban in Afghanistan, the administration began to redirect its energies toward Iraq and the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. In his 2002 State of the Union Address, his speech delivered just 4 months after the terrible al Qaeda attacks on our country, the President identified Iraq, Iran and North Korea

as the Axis of Evil; but very quickly thereafter it became clear that the administration would focus its attention narrowly on just one of these, Iraq. And even while bin Laden, the architect of the September 11 attacks, was still at large, Saddam Hussein took his place as the symbol of the new threat facing America.

Let me make something crystal clear here. Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator and his quest for weapons of mass destruction does pose a threat. The question for our country is what is the nature and extent of that threat, and what is the best way for us to address it.

I believe that our objective in Iraq should be Iraqi compliance with the U.N. resolutions that require Iraq to disarm and eliminate its weapons of mass destruction and its missiles that exceed the 93-mile range. I also believe that we must accomplish that objective in a way that strengthens rather than diminishes our national security. It would be a tragic irony indeed if in the name of fighting terrorism we made Americans less rather than more secure, both today and in the future.

Tonight I want to address three areas: First, the Bush administration's approach to Iraq; second, the implications for America's national security of that approach; and third, where do we go from here. So first, the Bush administration's approach to Iraq.

Following the President's 2002 Axis of Evil speech, the administration's goal of regime change in Iraq began to take shape quickly. As columnist William Safire observed, regime change is a diplomatic euphemism for overthrow of government or the toppling of Hussein.

On February 5, 2002, testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary of State Colin Powell stated, "We still believe strongly in regime change in Iraq, and we are looking at a variety of options that would bring that about."

By March of that year the debate in Washington over the pros and cons of military action against Iraq was fully engaged in the newspapers, the talk shows and the backrooms. Kenneth Adelman, President Reagan's arms control czar and a close ally of the hawks in the administration, wrote in the Washington Post that military action to remove Saddam Hussein and bring democracy to Iraq would be "a cake walk." Others, including former National Security Advisers to the President's father, Brent Scowcroft and James Baker, III, argued openly at that time against unilateral U.S. action to deal with Saddam.

Even the superhawks within the administration recognized that providing a legal rationale for regime change outside the context of the United Nations could prove tricky. While we may have the power, the power to go around knocking off nasty dictators, nothing under international law gives one country the right to invade another simply to change the regime. So what to do?

The Bush administration needed an argument, an argument that would provide the legal underpinning for unilateral American military action against Iraq or other nations that we determine to be a similar threat, and the answer devised by the administration was laid out in September 2002 in the national security strategy document, the so-called Doctrine of Preventive War. That theory is simple. It is also tempting. It goes like this: If we believe that a country will use weapons of mass destruction or arm terrorists with weapons of mass destruction against us, then we would "not hesitate to act alone if necessary to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively."

In other words, the United States has the right to strike militarily, even if we have no evidence that such activities are occurring. We do not have to know that an attack is imminent, we can act on our belief that such action may occur at some point. It may sound good, but it does not take much to see that this doctrine is a recipe for international chaos.

Mr. Speaker, just imagine if India and Pakistan adopted this approach, South Asia would be decimated. The Preventive War Doctrine violates every principle of international law that the United States has fought to uphold.

The Bush administration was in fact asserting that the United States would be exempt from the very rules we expect all other nations in the international community to obey, because under international law we, and any other country, already have the right to take military action to defend ourselves against an imminent attack upon ourselves or our citizens. If we know another country is about to launch missiles against us, we do not have to wait for the missiles to land, we can act preemptively. If we know a foreign government is arming terrorists with weapons of any kind, including weapons of mass destruction, we do not have to wait in order to strike. We can take preemptive action under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter in the face of that kind of imminent threat.

But Iraq does not fit into that framework. The administration has never claimed that Iraq was behind the September 11 attacks. It is not an imminent threat. It is not poised to attack us. We have no evidence that it has transferred or is going to transfer weapons of mass destruction to any terrorist group. It has never possessed missiles capable of delivering weapons onto U.S. soils, and it is currently in the process under the U.N. regime of destroying its missiles with a range of over 93 miles. Not even this administration has claimed that an Iraqi attack is imminent.

Now as the administration rolled out its new theory of preventive war, and molded its approach to Iraq it did not want to go to the United Nations originally, and it also wanted to cut Congress out of the process in the early

days. Administration lawyers claimed that the January 12, 1991 Congressional resolution authorizing the first President Bush to use force in the Persian Gulf War gave President Bush, the son, the right to send American troops into Iraq without further Congressional action.

The American people back then sensed that things were not going the right way. Polls showed that Americans might support military action against Iraq, but were not comfortable with America going it alone. And while the administration never conceded the legal point about having to go to Congress, it recognized the practical and political importance of requesting Congressional support, and it got it.

The Congressional resolution was, in my view, much too broad. It was a blank check. It gave the President the authority to take whatever military action he deemed appropriate without returning here to Congress for consent. Nevertheless, the Congressional debate and the resolution that was passed did reinforce the growing consensus that the President should work with our allies and the United Nations.

In November of last year, the administration itself, divided and under pressure from the American people, from Congress and British Prime Minister Tony Blair, took the very important decision to seek a new United Nations resolution on Iraq and put U.S. policy into the United Nations framework.

It was a great triumph for foreign policy of this country that on November 8, 2002, the United States got a unanimous Security Council vote for Resolution 1441, calling for resumption of inspections and enforcement of the U.N. resolutions on disarmament in Iraq. But what were the implications for us of going to the Security Council?

The decision to pursue action through the United Nations may have solved one problem, but it created another for the Bush administration. The administration's goal of regime change; in other words, getting rid of Saddam Hussein, did not fit with the more limited objective of enforcing Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions requiring Iraqi disarmament.

Administration hardliners who opposed going to the U.N. in the first place understood that these different goals could lead to very different approaches. They did not want to get mired in the U.N. process, and understood that their goal of forcibly removing Saddam Hussein from power was not necessarily consistent with the goal of enforcing U.N. resolutions. It was going to be like trying to fit the square peg into the round hole. And indeed, taking the case to the United Nations Security Council led to the clash of goals that is playing out today in the United Nations as we speak.

The U.N. strategy, going to the U.N., required the administration to shift its rhetoric and public justification of U.S. policy toward Iraq from regime change to the more limited objective, enforc-

ing Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions. But short of a coup, or Saddam Hussein leaving Iraq, regime change obviously requires military action, but enforcing the U.N. resolutions does not necessarily require toppling Saddam Hussein. And while military action may ultimately be required to enforce U.N. resolutions, the two goals, regime change and compliance with U.N. resolutions, dictate very different approaches and very different timetables.

□ 2215

In the U.N. context, the context we took ourselves in November of last year, regime change is the last-ditch option. It only becomes a choice after it is determined that disarmament has failed. How and when you reach that point and what efforts must be taken before you get to that point is not clearly spelled out in the resolution. In this process that we set up, the findings and judgment of the international inspectors headed by Hans Blix and the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohammed ElBaradei, hold enormous weight. And Iraq through its actions or inactions can influence the process and its outcome. The cost of going to the Security Council was clearly going to be over control of the timetable as we move forward.

But while the administration took the decision to go to the United Nations, it did not slow or adjust its military timetable. The deployment of U.S. forces went forward at an accelerated pace. The deadline for full deployment was mid-February or early March. We now have over 250,000 troops in the Gulf; and according to news reports, they are ready to attack whenever a decision is made. But the only deadline spelled out in Security Council Resolution 1441, passed unanimously by the Council on November 8, was that inspectors were to report to the Council on progress of disarmament, quote, "60 days after inspections resume," which turned out to be January 27, 2003. Resolution 1441 did not provide any guidance as to what would happen if Saddam Hussein was found to be at least in partial compliance with the inspections by this deadline, or if there was not a decision in the council to take military action by then. It did not foresee the situation we are in today, a U.N. process focused on the goal of disarmament with one timetable and the U.S. goal of regime change with its own military timetable.

Let me now talk about some of the other arguments that the administration has advanced as it faced increasing criticism for its approach, because there have been a number of additional arguments that have been made beyond the original argument that Iraq's quest for weapons of mass destruction and the possibility that it will give them to terrorists pose an unacceptable risk. The additional arguments rolled out by the administration include, number one, an alleged link between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, a link they have

failed to prove; two, the brutal nature of Saddam's regime and the need to liberate the Iraqi people; and, three, most recently, in the President's February 26 speech before the American Enterprise Institute, the argument that the overthrow of Hussein would be a catalyst for the spread of democracy throughout the Middle East and help bring about a final settlement to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Bush administration's new domino theory.

I want to discuss just two of these here: first, the argument that regime change is necessary because Saddam Hussein is evil; and, second, the claim that military action will prompt a democratic domino effect throughout the region.

First, the argument that military action is justified because Saddam Hussein is, quote, "an evil ruler." The hypocrisy of using this argument to justify regime change is difficult to ignore. Let us not forget that during the Iran-Iraq war the United States sided with Saddam Hussein. One of the central architects of current Bush administration policy, now-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, played a key role in the Reagan administration's decision to embrace Saddam Hussein in the early 1980s.

Declassified U.S. Government documents show that when Rumsfeld visited Baghdad in December 1983 as a special Presidential envoy to pave the way for the normalization of U.S.-Iraq relations, Iraq was using chemical weapons on a daily basis in defiance of international conventions. Five years later, in 1988, at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, I traveled to the Iraq-Turkish border as a staffer on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee with my colleague Peter Galbraith. At that time, thousands of Kurds were fleeing across the border to seek refuge in Turkey. We interviewed hundreds of those refugees and documented Iraq's use of chemical weapons against the Kurdish people. Our report formed the basis for legislation to impose economic sanctions against Iraq for its use of chemical weapons against the Kurds. The bill passed the United States Senate; but the Reagan administration, which included many of the key players in today's debate, many people who are now in the Bush administration, opposed and helped stop that sanctions legislation when it came here to the House of Representatives. I challenge anyone to explain to me how you can oppose economic sanctions in 1988 in response to Iraq's use of chemical weapons against civilians and then today turn around and say that those same actions justify U.S. military force in 2003.

Moreover, if Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against his own people was the reason for military action, we should have finished the job during the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Iraq has not used chemical weapons since 1988, since the time my colleague Peter Galbraith and I went to the Iraq-Turkish border at the end of the Iran-Iraq war.

But 3 years later in 1991, not only did we not remove Hussein in Baghdad but at the end of the war we looked the other way, the United States looked the other way for many days, while Saddam Hussein turned his guns on the Shias in the south and the Kurds in the north. This history, I think, exposes the hypocrisy of the position the government has taken today and the willingness of some people in the administration to say anything to further their ends. The liberation of the Iraqi people is certainly a desirable goal, but it is also an argument that could be applied to many other countries with brutal regimes around the world. It is not by itself sufficient justification for U.S. military action.

Now, more recently, the administration has advanced the argument that the removal of Saddam Hussein will not only liberate the Iraqi people but will result in the spread of democracy throughout the Middle East. Promoting democracy in the Middle East is a very attractive goal, but one this administration has neglected until now. We have made only feeble efforts to push even generally supportive governments in Saudi Arabia and Egypt to move toward more openness and more democracy. And after calling for greater democratization of the Palestinian Authority many months ago, the administration has done nothing to help bring that vision closer to reality. The belief that democracy is going to somehow blossom in the Middle East as a result of U.S. military occupation of Iraq is a dangerous hallucination. Since when do we think we can implant democratic institutions throughout a region with no experience in democracy through some kind of big bang theory? True democratic change must come from within the region. It cannot be imposed from without. We have not begun to succeed at building democracy in Afghanistan. On what basis do we think we can do much better in Iraq, let alone the entire Middle East? We need only look at the Balkans, for example, at how difficult the task will be.

Four years after military intervention, NATO has 35,000 troops stationed in Kosovo, a region of less than 2 million people, and their departure date is not yet on the horizon. Most experts believe that the withdrawal of those troops and others in Bosnia would result in a return to violence and hostilities. Iraq is a country of 23 million people. Like Yugoslavia, it is an artificial construct, in this case strung together by the British colonial powers and made up of three major groups, 60 percent Shia, 30 percent Sunni, 10 percent Kurds. The President has presented this utopian vision of democracy breaking out in the Middle East after we invade Iraq. It is just as easy to imagine a scenario where difficulties in Iraq and the American action there fuel resentment toward occupying American troops and inflame the region against us, strengthening the

hands of radical Islamic fundamentalists and making it more difficult to promote democracy and other U.S. goals in the region.

I recently came across an analysis of the imposing postwar task that we would face in Iraq, and I would like to share it with you. This is a quotation:

"It is not clear what kind of government you would put in. Is it going to be a Shia regime, a Sunni regime, or a Kurdish regime? Or is it one that tilts toward the Ba'athists, or one that tilts toward the Islamic fundamentalists? How much credibility is that government going to have if it is set up by the U.S. military? How long does the U.S. military have to stay to protect the people that sign on for that government? And what happens to it when we leave?"

These are the comments of none other than then-Secretary of Defense DICK CHENEY, speaking in April 1991 in support of former President Bush's decision to turn back on the road to Baghdad after we took Saddam Hussein's forces out of Kuwait. In fact, I agree with the 1991 DICK CHENEY. It will be a difficult, a costly and risky task to undertake the reconstruction of a postwar Iraq. It will take a long time, much longer than the 2 years the administration has suggested. It will take a sizable U.S. troop presence. And the U.S. Army's top uniformed officer has estimated that it would take hundreds of thousands of troops to feed the hungry and to keep the peace. Military action will also require enormous resources. Unofficial Pentagon estimates put the cost of the war alone at between \$65 and \$90 billion. The costs of reconstruction will be billions more.

So what are the implications? What are the implications of this policy for our security? I want to offer three observations: first, that the administration's approach to Iraq and the arrogance with which it has pursued its goals has badly damaged our ability to get the cooperation we need from others to protect our security interests and wage our long-term fight against terrorism. First, the administration's policies have triggered a rapid rise in anti-American sentiment around the world. There are those whose response to this sentiment is, hey, who cares? Their attitude: we're the big guys on the block, so who cares what they think? That swagger may make us feel good, but it is foolish. I care what the rest of the world thinks. We all should. We should care for the simple reason that what others think has an impact on our security. If our actions loosen our ties to our friends and allies, it undermines our ability to work together to combat terrorism. If our actions generate hatred and fuel the ranks of al Qaeda, it will increase the risk of attack upon us. If our actions undermine public support for friendly foreign governments, we may lose much more in the long run than we gain today. We may choose not to change our policies based on what others think, but it is

foolish not to try to understand the views of others when our own security is at risk.

Having the support of our friends and allies in the international community is important to the achievement of most of our foreign policy objectives. With respect to Iraq, cooperation would both reduce the cost of war and increase the prospects of winning the peace. In the 1991 Persian Gulf War, former President Bush and then-Secretary of State James Baker received U.N. Security Council backing for the use of force to expel Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. They assembled an impressive coalition of forces and succeeded in sharing the burden of the war. The military forces of 18 other countries participated in the Persian Gulf War, and more than 85 percent of the costs of that war were borne by others. In the current conflict, we face the opposite problem. Instead of having others help bear the burden, we are having to pay others to participate. Hence, some have dubbed the coalition that the administration has assembled not the coalition of the willing, but the coalition of the bought.

Having international support in Iraq would also greatly increase the prospects of winning the peace. In addition to providing financial and peacekeeping support, truly multilateral action in Iraq would help defuse any anger that otherwise would be directed solely against the United States. It would also be very helpful to have U.N. participation in the immediate postwar governing structure in Iraq to show that this is not a war of the United States against the Islamic and Arab worlds, but the world against Saddam Hussein.

Secondly, the Bush approach to Iraq has badly soured our relations with our NATO allies. As I mentioned earlier, the first and only time in the history of NATO that we invoked article 5 of the Washington treaty declaring an attack on one member to be an attack on all was after September 11. This dramatic action was followed by unprecedented cooperation in various aspects of the war on terrorism and the U.S.-led action in Afghanistan. In January, 2002, President Bush met in the Rose Garden with German Chancellor Schroeder and warmly praised Germany's role in the fight against terrorism, in particular for hosting the Bonn conference for multilateral assistance for the reconstruction of Afghanistan and the German role in training the Afghan police force. This sentiment has now given way to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's Euro-bashing, including his incendiary comments comparing Germany to Libya and Cuba. The division in NATO is greater today than at any other time in its history. Never before have several NATO allies actively worked to defeat a U.S. proposal in the Security Council.

What caused this dramatic turn-about? The administration expected

our allies to fall in lockstep behind its assessment of the Iraqi threat, behind its assessment of the extent to which Iraq has complied with the U.N. resolution and, most importantly, the administration's goal of regime change and its timetable for military action.

□ 2230

This approach probably reminded many of the way the Soviet Union used to dictate to the Warsaw Pact, rather than the traditional dialogue among NATO allies.

For many, the administration's "my way or the highway" approach to Iraq rekindled their resentment of the unilateralist approach to foreign policy issues that this administration took during its first 9 months in office, before September 11.

During that period, the administration thumbed its notices at the Kyoto Treaty on global climate change, walked away from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and an agreement to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention, and demonstrated its contempt for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the International Criminal Court.

While the administration could have offered amendments to address legitimate concerns with some of these agreements, it chose instead to abandon them altogether, totally dismissing the views of our allies and other nations.

Much of this unilateral action was forgotten immediately after September 11, but the administration's approach to Iraq has reopened old wounds. Unless this split in the alliance is healed, damage to our interests could be great. Our allies have been extremely helpful in tracking down al Qaeda cells around the world. They have allowed U.S. troops to traverse their air space or use their territory for numerous operations outside of Europe, including the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

NATO currently has 50,000 peacekeepers in the former Yugoslavia, and 14 NATO allies have forces on the ground in Afghanistan. It is very difficult to imagine a successful U.S.-led operation in Iraq without the support both during the war and during the reconstruction period without the support of many of our NATO allies.

Third, the administration's Iraq policy has undermined the United Nations. After the September 11 attacks, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted an American sponsored resolution to oblige all 189 member states to crack down on terrorism. Our ambassador to the United Nations, John Negroponte, called it "an unprecedented resolution on terrorism in the work of the United Nations."

Today, the administration argues that the United Nations will become irrelevant if it does not immediately adopt a second resolution supporting military force in Iraq. But it is disingenuous to claim that we are con-

cerned with the credibility of the United Nations and, at the same time, state that we will refuse to be bound by the Security Council unless it goes our way. Essentially our position is, the UN is relevant and credible only as long as it votes with us.

This kind of behavior undermines the legitimacy of the Security Council and the UN process. How can we credibly seek UN assistance and cooperation in the post-war building of Iraq, as we are, if we are unwilling to show respect for the UN process?

We cannot afford to forget the wide array of important issues that the United Nations deals with each day, from AIDS in Africa, peacekeeping in the Balkans, Cyprus, the Middle East and elsewhere. It is very much in our interest to have a viable and strong United Nations, and our actions should not undermine this goal.

Second, the administration's approach is likely to increase the risk of terrorist attack against the United States and threatens to plant the seeds for more deep-seated resentment in the Muslim world.

Last October, the CIA testified openly that Iraq for now, "appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks." In the United States. But, "should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would be much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions."

In testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee on February 6, 2003, CIA director George Tenet stated it this way: "The situation in the Middle East continues to fuel terrorism and anti-U.S. sentiment worldwide."

In the short-term, I think it is clear that the threat to Americans will grow. The real question is whether it will lead to a higher risk of terrorist attack in the long term.

Moderates in the region in the Middle East fear that a U.S. invasion will galvanize radical and ultra-conservative forces and lend them new credibility and legitimacy, swelling their ranks and increasing violent attacks. We should not forget that bin Laden has pointed to the U.S. presence in Saudi Arabia, our military presence there, the infidels in the Islamic sites of Mecca and Medina, as the catalyst for his deep-seated resentment of our Nation. One can only imagine that a U.S. military occupation of Baghdad, U.S. alone, could be a recruiting bonanza for al Qaeda and other terrorist groups.

Others argue that the war on Iraq will lead to regime change in the Middle East, but not the kind the administration envisions. Instead, the first regimes to go could be in Jordan and Pakistan, where pro-western governments have a fragile hold on angry populations. If Pakistan topples, many warn, al Qaeda could gain access to the nuclear weapons that Pakistan has.

The administration's single-minded focus on Iraq has also pushed out the consideration of other issues and badly

skewed our national security priorities. Osama bin Laden is still at large. Despite the recent arrests in Pakistan, other key al Qaeda operatives are at large. Dramatic attacks, like the one in Bali, Indonesia, earlier this year, demonstrate that the international terrorist network is alive and well.

By elevating the threat of Iraq to the most dangerous threat to American security today, the Bush administration has helped create the impression that Iraq possesses the ability somehow of "blowing the United States off the face of the Earth." In fact, while Iraq certainly presents a threat to its neighbors, and, in a worst case scenario, could act to facilitate a terrible terrorist attack on this country, it does not possess nuclear weapons, which are the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction, and, unlike North Korea or Iran, is subject to an international inspections regime ongoing which can prevent it from making progress toward that goal.

In fact, it is instructive to remember that of the three countries identified as the "axis of evil" in the President's 2002 State of the Union address, Iraq is the country farthest away from acquiring such weapons.

So, far from a simple "us versus them" world that the Bush administration has painted, America faces a national security challenge of enormous complexity. We must simultaneously cope with several separate and potentially grave threats, from Iraq to North Korea and the continuing threat of international terrorist networks. Without progress on nuclear nonproliferation, this list could grow quickly.

At the same time, we remain committed to an ongoing military presence in the states of the former Yugoslavia and to the elusive process of a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Lack of progress in both these areas could set back American security interests and lead to an escalation in violence and terrorism. In South Asia, two nuclear countries are poised army-to-army along a fragile border. And the list goes on. Eliminating Saddam Hussein will not address these very real problems.

So, finally, where do we go from here? We find ourselves at a crossroads. There is little daylight left. It is not a question of whether or not we can defeat Saddam Hussein militarily. We can. Rather, it is a question of the long-term risks to our security by proceeding in a manner that alienates our friends, creates opportunities for our foes, weakens the rule of law and undermines America's moral authority.

If the threat can be met in other ways, then why would we not pursue those options to their fullest? Some have argued that it is too late, that the cost of the huge U.S. deployments overseas demand that these troops not be brought home without seeing military action.

I disagree. The stakes are too high for that kind of thinking. The costs,

both human and financial, of deploying U.S. troops in the region, are insignificant compared to the costs of full U.S. military intervention and reconstruction of post-war Iraq.

We should not use our troop deployments as an excuse to act under an artificial timetable. Those deployments have played a role in achieving the more muscular inspections that we have seen in recent months.

We can always choose to take military action, but we cannot put the genie back in the bottle once we go down that road. Last Friday, Mr. ElBaradei, the Director of the IAEA, reported that there was no evidence of resumed nuclear activities in Iraq. He showed that the United States had unwittingly supplied the UN with forged documents to try and support our claim that Iraq had revived its nuclear weapons program.

The chief UN weapons inspector, Dr. Blix, who Secretary of State Powell has praised in the past as man of integrity and professionalism, Blix reported that Iraq had made progress toward disarmament and stated that the inspection process could be completed in a matter of months.

The use of force is a powerful and very important tool of foreign policy, but one that should generally be used as a last resort, when all other options fail. The heightened pressure the Bush administration has brought to bear on Iraq has focused world attention on Baghdad and reaped modest, but important, results with respect to Iraqi disarmament. I think most of the world believes that enforced UN inspections still have the potential to bring us to our primary goal, the disarmament of Iraq.

I believe the United States should give this process more time, both to further the goal of disarmament and to build broader international support for military action, should that become necessary to enforce the resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I believe that the overall approach this administration has taken is taking us in a dangerous direction. I believe our moral standing, our greatest source of strength, has been diminished. We cannot build a more democratic and a more open world on the administration's policies of preventative war, disdain for international law and neglect of international cooperation.

We have our work cut out for us. We must fight for policies that help rebuild America's moral authority in world affairs. We must articulate a credible alternative foreign policy doctrine that is not based on American exclusionism, but on America's stake as a leading partner in a diverse international community.

We are a strong and rich country. We experienced a terrible tragedy on September 11, 2001, but we do not have to act out of fear. Our strongest weapon against hatred and extremism are our high ideals, our democratic example founded on the rule of law. We cannot,

we must not, allow this administration in the name of those ideals to pursue policies that are not worthy of our Nation's great history.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina.

DEALING WITH A DEADLY CHALLENGE ON IRAQ

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and congratulate him on a very fine and thoughtful statement.

Mr. Speaker, there is a good possibility that our country will be at war in Iraq before the month is out. The President held out little hope for any alternative approach to disarming Iraq at his press conference last Thursday. Yet a majority of the American people continue to urge for more time for inspections while we are facing something close to a diplomatic meltdown with major allies. A failure to secure allied support will have major consequences for every American. Our citizens alone will shoulder the financial burden of this war and its aftermath. Our troops will need to be kept indefinitely in post-war Iraq, our country alone as an occupying force will be the target of hatred, resentment and hostility from many in the Arab world, and America will risk losing our standing among the world's democracies as one who leads by moral suasion and example as well as by military might.

Pollsters here at home say they have rarely seen an issue where the public's reaction is more conditional or ambivalent. Tonight I want to suggest this is because the Bush administration has not answered basic questions about this war and has backed us into a situation where we seem to be choosing between equally unsatisfactory ways of dealing with what most agree is a deadly challenge.

□ 2245

The distinguished historian William Leuchtenburg citing Thomas Jefferson's maxim that "great innovation should not be forced on slender majorities," recently contrasted George W. Bush's unilateralism to the behavior of previous wartime Presidents and found him "unique in his defiance of so much international and domestic opinion."

Many of our constituents believe that the full range and intensity of public opinion has not been visible or audible in Congress. One reason is that, by our vote of October 10 which gave the President an open-ended authorization for the use of force, this institution forfeited its coordinate decision-making role. Mr. Speaker, an up or down vote on a resolution authorizing force is at best a blunt instrument for checking the executive's constitutional dominance of foreign and military policy; but by granting unchecked authority months in advance, we made that instrument blunter yet.

Still, I believe the questions and the challenges to the President's approach

emanating from the Congress, and from Democratic Members in particular, have been more persistent and more consistent than most media accounts have acknowledged. It is true, Democrats were divided on final passage of the October resolution. And, in fact, this is not an issue on which a stance of absolute opposition is called for. We all understand Saddam Hussein to be a brutal dictator who is implacably hostile to our country and what we stand for. There is near unanimity in this body and in the international community that whatever capacity he has to make or use weapons of mass destruction must be ended.

But critical questions remain regarding alternative means to this end. Many Members of this body have raised these questions with increasing intensity in recent weeks; and unfortunately, the Bush administration has rarely provided satisfactory answers. What accounting do we have for the costs and risks of a military invasion? How are we to secure and maintain the support and engagement of our allies? Can Iraq be disarmed by means that do not divert us from or otherwise compromise equally or more urgent antiterrorist and diplomatic objectives? And do we have a credible plan for rebuilding and governing postwar Iraq, and have we secured the necessary international cooperation to ensure that this does not become a perceived U.S. occupation?

Administration officials, for example, have persistently refused to put a price tag on a U.S. invasion which, unlike the Gulf War, would have almost no financial backing from allies. The President's budget omits any reference to an Iraq war. With deficits for 2003 and 2004 already predicted to break historic records and \$2 trillion slated to be added to the national debt by 2008, the addition of \$80 billion to \$200 billion in war costs could not come as welcome news. But it is an insult to this body and to the American people to submit a budget that absolutely fails to give an honest accounting, even within broad limits, of what those costs would be.

Daily dispatches from Korea leave little doubt that North Korea is taking advantage of our preoccupation with Iraq to dangerously ratchet up its nuclear program, and that the administration's diplomacy has not been up to this challenge.

And now we learn that the Bush administration, which, truth to tell, has never had its heart in Middle East peace-making, has rebuffed its so-called quartet partners, the European allies, Russia, and the United Nations, and insisted on yet another postponement in publishing the long-anticipated "road map" to an Israeli-Palestinian settlement. Why? Because of the crisis in Iraq. President Bush in December demanded that release of the timetable for reciprocal steps and negotiations be delayed until after the Israeli elections. Now he is insisting

again that the effort be delayed, this time until after we deal with Iraq, seemingly thinking that victory in Iraq will be the key to solving this and most other problems in the Middle East.

As the New York Times editorialized last Sunday, "The Bush administration has not been willing to risk any political capital in attempting to resolve the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, but now the President is theorizing that invading Iraq will do the trick."

The fact is that the festering Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Bush administrations's failure to do anything about it represent an enormous obstacle to enlisting the support we need to achieve our objectives in the region, including the war on terrorism. That is certainly the way the Europeans see it; and the President's rebuff has further poisoned the atmosphere, even as the administration struggles to gain allied support for military action against Iraq. Among the angriest allies reportedly is Britain's Prime Minister Tony Blair, who for months has pleaded with President Bush to become more involved in Israeli-Palestinian peace-making.

The administration's torpedoing of the Quartet initiative is also ill advised and ill timed with respect to Palestinian efforts at reform. It comes precisely at the time that President Arafat, under considerable pressure, has nominated Mahmoud Abbas, otherwise known as Abu Mazen, for the new position of Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority. Abu Mazen, with whom the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and I had a cordial and useful visit in Ramallah in December, has been an outspoken critic of the militarization of the Palestinian uprising. How successful his appointment proves in reforming Palestinian governance will depend, among other things, on how much real authority he and his position are given. But President Bush could hardly have picked a more inauspicious time to throw cold water on the plans to get back to negotiations.

"There was a lot of dismay when the road map was put off before, and the dismay right now is even worse," one European diplomat told a New York Times reporter. "Without hope, the power of extremists will only grow," added another.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are the costs of allowing Iraq to trump everything else on our antiterrorist and diplomatic agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the world welcomed the President's decision last fall to take the Iraq matter to the United Nations and, apparently, to give more extensive inspections and the supervised destruction of weapons a chance to work. But his rhetoric since that time has led many to believe that he has always regarded the inspections as foreordained to failure and war as the only recourse. Suspicions have deepened as administration statements about links be-

tween Iraq and al Qaeda have become less and less measured. Such statements have helped persuade some 42 percent of the American public that Saddam Hussein was personally responsible for the 9-11 World Trade Center attacks. But prospective allies examining the rationale for war have understandably been less impressed.

Inspections, of course, are a two-way street. They will never work without Iraq's willing cooperation; and that cooperation, as Mr. Blix and Mr. El Baradei have made clear, has been far from satisfactory. No matter how numerous or how skilled the inspectors are, they cannot find what amounts to needles in haystacks without honest and complete information regarding the weapons and the material which the Iraqis claim to have destroyed and the whereabouts of any remaining stockpiles.

Still, it does matter how we reach the conclusion that Iraq has effectively continued its defiance that the inspections have failed, and that war is the only remaining option. In fact, the report of the inspectors at the United Nations last Friday significantly undermined the American position, arguing that progress has, in fact, been made and discounting the dangers of any Iraqi nuclear program.

It is essential that the world know and face the fact, as the President said last Saturday, that Iraq is still violating the demands of the United Nations by refusing to disarm. But we undermine our own credibility when we scoff at the destruction of a stockpile of Al Samoud missiles as a matter of no consequence, or insist on a U.N. resolution with so short a time frame as to make it seem merely a pretext for war.

In fact, the U.N. inspectors themselves have specified the tasks remaining before them, and there is every reason to support the systematic pursuit of those objectives within a tight, but feasible, time frame. In the meantime, we must resist the notion that the alternatives confronting us are either to invade in the next few days or to appear to "back down" in a humiliating and dangerous fashion.

It is true that the massing of 235,000 troops has created a momentum of its own, and they cannot stay in place indefinitely. But the risks and the costs of an invasion undertaken in the face of major allied opposition remain, and we need to give full consideration to options that avoid either leaving Iraq's weapons in place or inexorably marching to war.

What might those options be? Michael Walzer has suggested intensifying what he calls the "little war" in which we are already engaged and challenging the French and the Germans and the Russians to become part of the solution. This could include extension of no-fly zones to cover the entire country, maintaining an embargo on strategic and dual-use materials,

and intensifying the program of inspections and weapons destruction under international control.

If such a program succeeded in destroying or neutralizing Iraq's weapons capability, the U.S. and the U.N. could credibly declare their mission accomplished, and most of the troops could return home, having created the military pressure that helped prompt compliance. I realize that at present, prospects for such an outcome appear to be fading. But when we are in an untenable position, contemplating outcomes that are equally unacceptable, we have an obligation to press in new directions.

Mr. Speaker, whatever course our President and our country take, we will give our men and women in uniform our full support, and I am confident that a unified Congress will provide whatever resources they need to succeed. I have been moved by the farewell ceremonies for National Guard units in my own district, and I have the utmost respect for the service and sacrifice that these men and women exemplify. The debates we have over foreign and military policy do not change that in the least. In fact, we owe them, and all of our citizens, this debate, so that we do not choose our Nation's course either impulsively or by default, but with due consideration of our Nation's interests and values, and consideration of how our vast power can be a force for what is just and right in the world. May God grant us wisdom and courage for the facing of these days.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of injuries suffered in a car accident and doctor's orders to stay in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINE) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, March 12 and 13.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, March 12 and 13.

Mr. COX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 13.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 2003, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1028. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiophanate Methyl; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2002-0355; FRL-7285-9] received February 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1029. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-0344; FRL-7289-7] received February 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1030. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 6-Benzyladenine; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2002-0308; FRL-7287-2] received February 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1031. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxadiazon; Tolerance Revocations [OPP-2002-0086; FRL-7187-3] received January 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1032. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 4-(Dichloroacetyl)-1-Oxa-4-Azaspiro [4.5] Decane; Pesticide Import Tolerance [OPP-2002-0245; FRL-7199-4] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1033. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Tolerance Exemptions for Polymers [OPP-2003-0039; FRL-7291-7] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1034. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pelargonic Acid (Nonanoic Acid); Exemption from the Requirement of a Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-273; FRL-7278-7] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1035. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills [OAR-2002-0045; AD-FRL-7446-6] (RIN: 2060-AK53) received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1036. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program [Region II Docket No. NJ55-248, FRL-7441-4] received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1037. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling MWC Emissions From Existing Municipal Waste Combustors [NH-51-7175a; FRL-7447-7] received February 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1038. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to Volatile Organic Compound Requirements from Specific Processes [MD129/130-3089a; FRL-7437-7] received February 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1039. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Control District [CA 271-0374a; FRL-7427-8] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1040. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Listing of Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances [FRL-7443-4] (RIN: 2060-AG12) received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1041. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ohio: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7442-8] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1042. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Non-attainment as of November 15, 1999, and Reclassification of the Metropolitan Washington, D.C. Ozone Nonattainment Area; District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia [DC039-2030; MD073-3101; VA090-5063; FRL-7441-9] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1043. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clarification to Interim Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiry Under CERCLA and Notice of Future Rulemaking Action [FRN-7442-4] (RIN: 2050-AF05) received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1044. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Florida: Approval of Revisions to the Florida State Implementation Plan [FL-82-200309a; FRL-7443-3] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1045. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA255-0385; FRL-7448-1] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1046. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1047. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Northern Engraving Environmental Cooperative Agreement [WI112-01-7342b, FRL-7411-5] received January 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1048. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [CA273-0381a; FRL-7 452-3] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1049. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones, Security Zones, Drawbridge Operation Regulations and Special Local Regulations [USCG-2002-13968] received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1050. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean Bad Boys II Film Production [COTP

Miami 02-118] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1051. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile 602.0 to 604.0, Louisville, Kentucky [COTP Louisville 02-06] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1052. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Huntington Beach Offshore Grand Prix, Huntington Beach, California [COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach 02-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1053. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations; Indian River, 4th of July Celebration, Cocoa, FL. [COTP Jacksonville 02-083] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1054. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay — Port of Miami, Miami FL. [COTP Miami 02-107] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1055. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Southwest Pass Sea Buoy To Nashville Ave Wharf, Mile Marker 100.8, above Head of Passes, Lower Mississippi River, New Orleans, Louisiana [COTP New Orleans-02-020] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1056. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile 497.5 to 497.7, LeClaire, IA [COTP St. Louis 02-014] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1057. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile 496.4 to 496.6, LeClaire, IA [COTP St. Louis 02-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1058. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile Marker 612.0 to 625.0 [COTP Paducah, KY 02-008] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1059. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cassville Twin-O-Rama Fire Works, Cassville WI [COTP St. Louis, MO-02-012] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1060. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Highway 90 Bridge, Pascagoula River, Pascagoula, Mississippi [COTP Mobile, AL 02-016] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1061. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Bad Boys II Film Production [COTP Miami 02-113] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1062. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Biscayne Bay Dinner Key Channel, FL. [COTP Miami 02-103] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1063. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Colorado River, Laughlin, NV [COTP San Diego 02-008] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1064. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Port of Miami Bad Boys II Film Production [COTP Miami 02-092] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1065. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami River, Miami FL [COTP Miami 02-075] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1066. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 590.5 to 592.0, Rosedale, Mississippi [COTP Memphis-02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1067. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Cumberland River, Mile Marker 190.5 to 192.0, Nashville, Tennessee [COTP Paducah-02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1068. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Mile Marker 943.0 to 945.0 [COTP Paducah, KY 02-007] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1069. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, CA [COTP San Diego 02-014] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1070. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, New Jersey Pierhead Channel, NJ [CGD01-02-086] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1071. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 4th of July Celebration, Salem, Massachusetts [CGD1-02-087] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1072. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kansas City Aviation and Air show Expo, Kansas City, MO [COTP St. Louis 02-015] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1073. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile 662.5 to 663.6, Lansing IA [COTP St. Louis, MO-02-016] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1074. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Middletown 4th of July Fireworks Display, Connecticut River, CT [CGD01-02-066] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1075. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Orchard Beach, Long Island Sound, NY [CGD01-02-079] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1076. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Main Pass, Block 4, 29 degrees 41'34"N, 089 degrees 20'22"W, Gulf of Mexico [COPT New Orleans-02-021] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1077. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi River Gulf Outlet Channel, mile marker 49.0, in the vicinity of light 111 and 112, Louisiana [COTP New Orleans-02-019] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 877. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve patient safety; with an amendment (Rept. 108-31, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; with an amendment (Rept. 108-32, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; with an amendment (Rept. 108-32, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 866. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to enhance the security of wastewater treatment works (Rept. 108-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 877. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than March 13, 2003.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 1169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the performance of certain tax collection services by contractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1170. A bill to protect children and their parents from being coerced into administering psychotropic medication in order to attend school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1171. A bill to provide grants to law enforcement agencies to use iris scanning technology to conduct background checks on individuals who want to purchase guns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, to provide for the use of gold in the metal content of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BURR, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 1173. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1174. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Tiger Woods, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship, and in breaking barriers with grace and dignity by showing that golf is a sport for all people; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. DEMINT):

H.R. 1175. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits through fiscal year 2008, to extend paygo for direct spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1176. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, relating to the I-35 High Priority Corridor from Laredo, Texas, to Duluth, Minnesota; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BURR, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional choice regarding unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for medical malpractice liability insurance premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1179. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit an individual to operate a commercial motor vehicle solely within the borders of a State if the individual meets certain minimum standards prescribed by the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 1180. A bill to promote the use of hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina):

H.R. 1181. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to ensure that promoting recreation is treated as a primary purpose in the operation of dams and reservoirs under the possession and control of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1182. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude brachytherapy devices from the prospective payment system for outpatient hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1183. A bill to promote the Sensible Development of Renewable Energy in the Waters of the Coastal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1184. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase certain criminal penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 1185. A bill to clarify the tax status of the Young Men's Christian Association retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 1186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for proration of the heavy vehicle use tax between successive purchasers of the same vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 1187. A bill to impose a retroactive, 2-year moratorium on inclusion of unemployment compensation in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1188. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for American Samoa treatment under the Medicaid Program similar to that provided to States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1189. A bill to increase the waiver requirement for certain local matching requirements for grants provided to American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the eligibility for housing loans guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the Native American Housing Loan Pilot Program to vet-

erans who are married to Native Americans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 1191. A bill to provide a grant program for gifted and talented students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. FARR, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. STARK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1192. A bill to provide for livable wages for Federal Government workers and workers hired under Federal contracts; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 1193. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority for certain chaplain-led family support programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1194. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to enable Federal agencies responsible for the preservation of threatened species and endangered species to rescue and relocate members of any of those species that would be taken in the course of certain reconstruction, maintenance, or repair of Federal or non-Federal manmade flood control levees; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a demonstration program under the Medicare Program to examine the clinical and cost effectiveness of providing medical adult day care center services to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1196. A bill to provide a United States voluntary contribution to the United Nations Population Fund; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1197. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer products safety standard that requires manufacturers of certain consumer products to establish and maintain a system for providing notification of recalls of such products to consumers who first purchase

such a product; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 1198. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to prohibit the selection for closure or adverse realignment under such law any military installation used for undergraduate pilot training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. DIN-

GELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOFFEFL, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1199. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary Medicare prescription medicine benefit, to provide greater access to affordable pharmaceuticals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost and enhance the quality of the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1201. A bill to posthumously revoke the naturalization of Eriberto Mederos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RENZI, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 1202. A bill to provide for a period of quiet reflection at the opening of certain schools on every school day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1203. A bill to provide for the annual audit of the White County Bridge Commission, for the New Harmony Bridge over the Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to establish requirements for the award of concessions in the National Wildlife Refuge System, to provide for maintenance and repair of properties located in the System by concessionaires authorized to use such properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1205. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to guarantee comprehensive health care coverage for all children born after 2004; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 1206. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development if the United Nations or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development imposes any tax or fee on United States per-

sons, continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees, or attempts to implement or impose a policy that would enable foreign governments to tax income earned inside the borders of the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to withhold Federal student financial assistance from students who have engaged in hazing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1208. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 for United States contributions to the International Fund for Ireland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 1209. A bill to extend the authority for the construction of a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DICKS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. VISLOSKY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1210. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Holocaust Insurance Registry by the Archivist of the United States and to require certain disclosures by insurers to the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1211. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide Federal aid and economic stimulus through a one-time revenue grant to the States and their local governments; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 1212. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of basic educational assistance for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill, and to eliminate reductions of basic pay for eligibility for such assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr.

COSTELLO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1213. A bill to facilitate the production and generation of coal-based power; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 1214. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide public access to quality medical imaging procedures and radiation therapy procedures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1215. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the provision of a written prompt payment policy to each subcontractor under a Federal contract and to require a clause in each subcontract under a Federal contract that outlines the provisions of the prompt payment statute and other related information; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1216. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the minimum Government-wide goal for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1217. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide a penalty for the failure by a Federal contractor to subcontract with small businesses as described in its subcontracting plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1218. A bill to require contractors with the Federal Government to possess a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of sexual assault in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Day of Silence; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Turkey's claims of sovereignty over islands and islets in the Aegean Sea; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Children's Internet Protection Act is constitutional as it applies to public libraries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. OLIVER):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should respect the sovereign equality of the member states of the United Nations Security Council with respect to each state's position concerning Iraq's compliance with Resolution 1441; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. OTTER:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to hunt such birds; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 134. A resolution electing Members to serve on the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 135. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Administration in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H. Res. 136. A resolution congratulating the American Dental Association for establishing the "Give Kids a Smile" program, emphasizing the need to improve access to dental care for children, and thanking dentists for volunteering their time to help provide needed dental care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H. Res. 137. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that changes to Title IX athletics policies contradict the spirit of athletic equality and gender parity and should not be implemented, and that Title IX should be kept intact; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H. Res. 138. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that small business concerns should continue to play an active role in assisting the United States military, Federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies, and State and local police forces by designing and developing innovative products to combat terrorism, and that Federal, State, and local governments should aggressively seek out and purchase innovative technologies and services from small business concerns to improve homeland defense and aid in the fight against terrorism; to the Committee on Small Business.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 5: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 20: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WALLER, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 40: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 44: Mr. PITTS, Ms. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 57: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 58: Mr. KIND, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FARR, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. NEY, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 105: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 107: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 114: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 119: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 153: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 207: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 235: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 259: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 284: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. TANCREDI.

H.R. 300: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 303: Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. REYES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 340: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 372: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 401: Mr. KIRK, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 411: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 412: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 419: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 441: Ms. LEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 446: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 447: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 448: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 453: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 482: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 490: Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. BOYD, Mr. FORD, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 517: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 527: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 528: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 531: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 533: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 571: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 613: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 660: Mr. CASE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 664: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 671: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 673: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 683: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 684: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 690: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 703: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 713: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 714: Mr. BONNER and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 720: Ms. DUNN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MEEK

of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 728: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BASS, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 729: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 735: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 737: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 741: Mr. CASE and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 745: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 758: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 765: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 767: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 768: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 798: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 800: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 802: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 811: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 839: Mr. COLE and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 844: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 847: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 857: Mr. FILNER and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 859: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 882: Mr. PITTS, Mr. FROST, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 886: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 887: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 893: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 898: Mr. BALLANCE.

H.R. 919: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 925: Mr. HYDE, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 931: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 934: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 936: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 941: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 953: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 976: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 977: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 979: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 980: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WEXLER, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1005: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1007: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FROST, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1013: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OSE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1057: Mr. WATT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1068: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. COX, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 1070: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1077: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1093: Mr. COOPER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1096: Mr. REYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1097: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILLNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1102: Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1105: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1114: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr.

CARTER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1116: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1120: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1125: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOFFEL, and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 1126: Mr. BEAUPREZ and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1144: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1145: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1146: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1147: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1157: Mr. OTTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PAS-
TOR, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. Res. 8: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 24: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr.

OWENS, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CANTOR.

H. Con. Res. 25: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. DINGELL.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 12: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 39: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 59: Mr. HOBSON.

H. Res. 133: Mr. CHABOT.